A. CHELEN ROJAS

¿Quiénes son los "Amigos del Pueblo" y cómo luchan contra los socialdemócratas?

V. I. LENIN

¿Quiénes son los "Amigos del Pueblo" y cómo luchan contra los socialdemócratas?

(Respuesta a los artículos antimarxistas de la revista *Russkoie Bogatstvo*)

LAUTARO
BUENOS AIRES

B2 K0 129 0

LIBRO DE EDICION ARGENTINA
Queda hecho el depósito que marca la ley 11.723
Copyright 1946 by EDITORIAL LAUTARO — Buenos Aires
IMPRESO EN LA ARGENTINA — PRINTED IN ARGENTINE

A. CHELEN ROJAS

NOTA DE LA EDITORIAL

Incluímos en este volumen dos obras fundamentales de Lenin del período de lucha por la creación del Partido Obrero Socialdemócrata en Rusia, tituladas:

I. *¿Quiénes son los "Amigos del Pueblo" y cómo luchan contra los socialdemócratas?* y,

II. *Las tareas de los socialdemócratas rusos.*

¿Quiénes son los "Amigos del pueblo" y cómo luchan contra los socialdemócratas? fué escrito en la primavera-verano de 1894 en tres partes (volúmenes), siendo impreso ilegalmente aquel mismo año. Damos en esta edición solo la primera parte (Volumen I). El libro completo se encuentra en las "Obras Completas", t. I, página 51-222, edición rusa.

Constituye éste, uno de los primeros trabajos de Lenin, quien contaba en esa época sólo 24 años.

En esta obra se pone al desnudo la verdadera esencia de los populistas [1], que se presentaban como "amigos del pueblo", cuando en realidad actuaban *contra* el pueblo.

Hacia fines del siglo pasado los populistas habían renegado de toda lucha revolucionaria contra el gobierno zarista. Actuaban en realidad como voceros de los intereses de los kulaks. Al mismo tiempo en su prensa, los populistas mantenían una campaña de difamación contra los marxistas.

Lenin demostró precisamente que los verdaderos amigos del pueblo que querían acabar con la opresión de los capitalistas y de los terratenientes y destruir el zarismo, no eran los populistas, sino los marxistas.

También debe señalarse que en esta obra Lenin destaca, por vez primera, la idea de la alianza revolucionaria entre los obreros y los campesinos como medio fundamental para derrocar al zarismo.

1. Recibieron el nombre de *populistas* aquellos sectores — especialmente de la pequeña burguesía — que entendían, erróneamente, que la fuerza revolucionaria fundamental no era la clase obrera, sino los campesinos, que el poder del zar y de los terratenientes se podía derrocar pura y simplemente por medio de "revueltas" campesinas. La juventud intelectual revolucionaria, vistiendo la ropa campesina, se lanzó a la aldea, "al pueblo". Y de aquí les viene el nombre de *populistas*. Pero los campesinos no les siguieron, ya que aquellos hombres no les conocían ni les comprendían como es debido. La sociedad populista clandestina "Narodnaia Volia" ("Voluntad del pueblo") organizó el asesinato al zar Alejandro II en 1881. Seguidamente al aniquilamiento del partido "Voluntad del Pueblo" renegó de la lucha revolucionaria contra el gobierno zarista y comenzó a predicar la reconciliación y la armonía con el zarismo. (Véase para todo lo relativo a esta *Nota de la Editorial* la "Historia del Partido Comunista [bolchevique] de la U.R.S.S.", Ediciones en Lenguas Extranjeras, Moscú, 1931, capítulo I).

En esta obra se pone al desnudo la verdadera esencia de los populistas [1], que se presentaban como "amigos del pueblo", cuando en realidad actuaban *contra* el pueblo.

Hacia fines del siglo pasado los populistas habían renegado de toda lucha revolucionaria contra el gobierno zarista. Actuaban en realidad como voceros de los intereses de los kulaks. Al mismo tiempo en su prensa, los populistas mantenían una campaña de difamación contra los marxistas.

Lenin demostró precisamente que los verdaderos amigos del pueblo que querían acabar con la opresión de los capitalistas y de los terratenientes y destruir el zarismo, no eran los populistas, sino los marxistas.

También debe señalarse que en esta obra Lenin destaca, por vez primera, la idea de la alianza revolucionaria entre los obreros y los campesinos como medio funda-

1. Recibieron el nombre de *populistas* aquellos sectores — especialmente de la pequeña burguesía — que entendían, erróneamente, que la fuerza revolucionaria fundamental no era la clase obrera, sino los campesinos, que el poder del zar y de los terratenientes se podía derrocar pura y simplemente por medio de "revueltas" campesinas. La juventud intelectual revolucionaria, vistiendo la ropa campesina, se lanzó a la aldea, "al pueblo". Y de aquí les viene el nombre de *populistas*. Pero los campesinos no les siguieron, ya que aquellos hombres no les conocían ni les comprendían como es debido. La sociedad populista clandestina "Narodnaia Volia" ("Voluntad del pueblo") organizó el asesinato al zar Alejandro II en 1881. Se intensificó la represión en ese entonces; la mayoría de los populistas, seguidamente al aniquilamiento del partido "Voluntad del Pueblo" renegó de la lucha revolucionaria contra el gobierno zarista y comenzó a predicar la reconciliación y la armonía con el zarismo. (Véase para todo lo relativo a esta *Nota de la Editorial* la "Historia del Partido Comunista [bolchevique] de la U.R.S.S.", Ediciones en Lenguas Extranjeras, Moscú, 1931, capítulo I).

mental para derrocar el Poder del zarismo, de los terratenientes y de la burguesía.

La lucha de Lenin y de sus partidarios contra el populismo condujo, ya en la década del 90, al completo y definitivo aplastamiento ideológico del populismo.

Las tareas de los socialdemócratas rusos, fué publicado en folleto, en Ginebra, habiendo sido escrita a fines de 1897.

En este folleto Lenin analiza una serie de cuestiones fundamentales vinculadas a las actividades prácticas de la socialdemocracia: analiza el programa, los métodos de actividad y las tácticas políticas.

Discrimina sobre la *propaganda* y la *agitación* en las actividades socialistas y en las actividades democráticas que competen a un movimiento socialdemócrata, explicando magistralmente la interconexión entre las consignas reivindicativas con las consignas puramente políticas.

En este trabajo señala con mucha fuerza la necesidad imperiosa de organizar un partido obrero socialdemócrata único para toda Rusia. Sabido es que ya en 1898 pudo lograrse ralizar el primer Congreso del Partido Obrero Social Demócrata de Rusia.

Ya en prensa este libro, las agencias informativas trasmitieron el texto de un artículo publicado en la revista "Bolshevik", por Mijail Kalinin, entonces Presidente de la U. R. S. S. en uno de cuyos pasajes afirma que la argumentación de Lenin es "Quiénes son los amigos del

pueblo", hoy es "más válida aún que en el momento en que la presentó en su folleto en el año 1894". Poco más adelante agrega: "con el propósito de un mejor entendimiento de la posición teórica de Stalin, su estrategia y sus tácticas, sería sumamente provechoso para los jóvenes soviéticos estudiar este primer trabajo importante de Lenin".

El texto y la traducción de la presente edición es del Instituto Marx, Engels y Lenin, publicado por "Ediciones en Lenguas Extranjeras", Moscú, 1941.

También corresponden a esa edición la mayoría de las Notas de la Editorial, habiendo agregado nosotros unas pocas referencias bibliográficas.

Las notas de Lenin no llevan indicación alguna.

Pág.

Nota de la Editorial 7

¿Quiénes son los "Amigos del Pueblo" y cómo luchan contra los socialdemócratas? 11

Las tareas de los socialdemócratas rusos 119

Las tareas de los socialdemócratas rusos

La segunda mitad de la década del 90 se caracteriza por una notable reanimación en el planteamiento y solución de los problemas revolucionarios rusos. La aparición de un nuevo partido revolucionario, el de *Naródnoie Pravo* ["Derecho del Pueblo"], la creciente influencia y los éxitos de los socialdemócratas, la evolución interna de *Naródnaia Volia* ["Voluntad del Pueblo"], fueron factores que trajeron consigo una viva discusión de las cuestiones programáticas, tanto en los círculos socialistas intelectuales y obreros como en las publicaciones ilegales. Son de mencionar, en lo que a esto último se refiere, el *Nasuschni Voprós* ["Problema Vital"] y el *Manifiest* ["Manifiesto"] (1894) del partido *Naródnoie Pravo*, el *Letuchi listok gruppi Naródnoi Voli* ["Hoja volante del grupo "Naródnaia Volia"], *Rabótnik* ["El militante"], editado en el extranjero por la *Unión de los socialdemócratas rusos*, la creciente actividad en la edición de folletos revolucionarios en Rusia, dedicados principalmente a los obreros, la labor de agitación, realizada por la *Unión de lucha por la emancipación de la clase obrera*, agrupación socialdemócrata de Petersburgo, con motivo de las memorables huelgas petersburguesas de 1896, etc.

tuales", cuya impotencia, cuando se aparta de los intereses reales de las masas, reconoce incluso *Nasuschni Voprós*. Para esto es necesario que los *narodopravtsi* abandonen toda pretensión de fundir los más diversos elementos sociales y de separar el socialismo de los objetivos políticos, que abandonen la falsa vergüenza que les impide acercarse a las capas burguesas del pueblo, es decir, que no solamente hablen de un programa político de no-socialistas, sino que actúen de acuerdo con semejante programa, despertando y desarrollando la conciencia de clase de aquellos grupos y clases sociales para los que el socialismo en general no es necesario, pero que mientras más avanza el tiempo, más sentirán la opresión del absolutismo y la necesidad de libertades políticas.

La socialdemocracia rusa es aún muy joven. Apenas empieza a salir del estado embrionario en que el lugar predominante lo ocupaban los problemas teóricos. Apenas comienza a desarrollar su actividad práctica. En lugar de criticar las teorías y programas socialdemócratas, los revolucionarios de otras fracciones, obligados por la fuerza de las circunstancias, tienen que criticar la actividad *práctica* de los socialdemócratas rusos.

Y hay que reconocer que esta última crítica se distingue marcadamente de la crítica teórica, se distingue hasta el punto de que ha sido posible lanzar rumores tan cómicos como el de que la *Unión de Lucha* petersburguesa es una organización no-socialdemócrata. La misma existencia de este rumor demuestra cuán injusta es la acusación de ignorar la lucha política que circula contra los socialdemócratas. La misma existencia de tal rumor evidencia que muchos revolucionarios, a los que no ha podido convencer la *teoría* de los socialdemócratas, comienzan a convencerse por su *práctica*.

La socialdemocracia rusa tiene ante sí un enorme campo de trabajo apenas iniciado. El despertar de la clase obrera rusa, su tendencia espontánea hacia el saber, hacia

la unificación, hacia el socialismo, hacia la lucha contra sus explotadores y opresores se revela cada día en formas más claras y amplias.

Los gigantescos progresos realizados por el capitalismo ruso en los últimos tiempos, constituyen una garantía de que el movimiento obrero crecerá constantemente en extensión y profundidad. En el momento actual estamos, por lo visto, en el período del ciclo capitalista en que la industria "florece", el comercio se desarrolla audazmente, las fábricas trabajan a toda presión y aparecen como setas después de la lluvia nuevas fábricas, nuevas empresas, sociedades anónimas, construcciones ferroviarias, etc., etc. No hay que ser profeta para predecir la bancarrota inevitable que (más o menos violentamente) debe seguir a este "florecimiento" de la industria. Tal bancarrota arruinará a gran número de pequeños propietarios, lanzará a la calle a las masas obreras y planteará de este modo agudamente a toda la masa obrera los problemas del socialismo y del democratismo, que ya hace mucho están planteados para cada obrero consciente, para todo obrero que piensa. Los socialdemócratas rusos deben cuidar de que esta bancarrota encuentre al proletariado más consciente, más unido, con una comprensión de los objetivos de la clase obrera rusa, con capacidad de oponerse a la clase capitalista, que obtiene hoy ganancias gigantescas y trata siempre de cargar las pérdidas sobre los hombros de los obreros, con capacidad de ponerse al frente de la democracia rusa en una decidida lucha contra el absolutismo policiaco, que ata de pies y manos al obrero y a todo el pueblo ruso.

¡Por tanto, camaradas, manos a la obra! ¡No perdamos un tiempo tan precioso! ¡Los socialdemócratas rusos

tienen ante sí un trabajo inmenso si quieren atender a las necesidades del proletariado que despierta, organizar el movimiento obrero, fortalecer los grupos revolucionarios y los lazos que los unen, procurar a los obreros literatura de propaganda y agitación, unir los círculos obreros y los grupos socialdemócratas diseminados por todos los confines de Rusia en un *partido obrero socialdemócrata* único!

DE LA MISMA COLECCION

1. — COMO SE PREPARO RUSIA, de M. Edelman (agotado) ..... $ 2.—
2. — CAMARADA YENIA (agotado) ..... „ 1.80
3. — ORDZHONIKIDSE, HEROE DEL CAUCASO, de V. Sablin y Z. Fazin ..... „ 2.50
4. — EL PUEBLO ES INMORTAL, de Vasili Grossman ..... „ 2.—
5. — CUENTOS SOVIETICOS, de Ehrenburg, W. Wasilevska y otros ..... „ 2.—
6. — LA LUCHA DE GUERRILLAS A LA LUZ DE LOS CLASICOS DEL MARXISMO-LENINISMO ..... „ 2.—
7. — EL ARTE DE DIRIGIR LA NATURALEZA DE LAS PLANTAS, por T. D. Lysenko ..... „ 2.—
8. — CIENCIA EN LA U.R.S.S., por varios sabios norteamericanos ..... „ 2.—
9. — LA VIDA DE MAXIMO GORKI, de A. Rosskin ..... „ 2.—
10. — FUNDAMENTOS DEL LENINISMO Y EN TORNO A LOS PROBLEMAS DEL LENINISMO, de J. Stalin ..... „ 2.50
11. — DEL SOCIALISMO UTOPICO AL SOCIALISMO CIENTIFICO, de Federico Engels ..... „ 2.—
12. — EL INCENDIO DEL REICHSTAG, de Jorge Dimitrof ..... „ 2.50
13. — LUDWIG FEUERBACH Y EL FIN DE LA FILOSOFIA CLASICA ALEMANA, de F. Engels ..... „ 2.—
14. — MARX COMO HOMBRE, PENSADOR Y REVOLUCIONARIO ..... „ 2.50
15. — GEOGRAFIA DE BOLSILLO DE LA U.R.S.S. de N. N. Mijailov ..... „ 2.50
16. — LA CULTURA EN LA UNION SOVIETICA, de Gopner, Fersman y Derjavine ..... „ 2.—

Este libro se terminó de
imprimir el 25 de junio
de 1946, en los Talleres
MACLAND (S. R. L.)
Córdoba 3965 - Bs. Aires

What the "friends of the people" are and how they fight the social-democrats (Lenin, en-may 1894)

(A reply to articles in Russkoye Bogatstvo opposing the marxists)

Contexto

i) Trabajo en el libro de 1892-3 en Samara objetivo criticar narodniki Mihakilovsky y otros

Lenin started working on this book in Samara in 1892-93. In the Samara Marxist circle he delivered lectures in which he severely criticised the anti-Marxist liberal Narodniks V V. (Vorontsov), Mikhailovsky, Yuzhakov, and Krivenko. These lectures served as preparatory material for the book

ii) Lectura oral de Lenin en 1894 a circulos marxistas en San Petersburgo

In the autumn of 1894 Lenin read his work, What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats, to members of the St. Petersburg Marxist circle…Hectographed copies of it circulated afterwards from hand to hand under the name of "The Yellow Copy-Books." They were unsigned

iii) Circuló por importantes Rusia por partes, entero, reproducido a mano (ya en 1896 era un libro de formación básico del marxismo ruso)

The first part was hectographed in June 1894 in St. Petersburg, and was illegally circulated there and in other cities. A second edition of this first part, printed the same way, appeared in July 1894. About 100 copies of the first and second parts were printed by A. A. Ganshin in August in Gorki (Vladimir Gubernia) and in September in Moscow…Local organisations made copies of Lenin's work by various means, some parts being handwritten, others typewritten, etc. A group of Social-Democrats in Borzna Uyezd of Chernigov Gubernia hectographed copies of the book in 1894; copies of this edition were circulated in Chernigov, Kiev, and St. Petersburg. At the end of 1894 the book was being read in Vilno; in 1895 in Penza; and at about the same time in Vladimir. In 1895-1896 it circulated among Marxist students in Tomsk. At the same time it was being read in Rostov-on-Don, in 1896, in Poltava and other towns

Lenin's book was well known to the Emancipation of Labour group, and also to other Russian Social-Democratic organisations abroad.

iv) Contexto de republicación (segunda edición 1923, tercera 1936)

Copies of the hectographed edition of the first and the third parts of the book were discovered in the early part of 1923 in the archives of the Berlin Social-Democratic organisation, and almost simultaneously in the State Saltykov-Shchedrin Public Library in Leningrad.

In the first, second and third editions of V. I. Lenin's Collected Works, it was printed according to the hectographed editions of 1894 discovered in 1923.

In 1936, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism acquired a further copy of the hectographed edition of 1894. This copy contains numerous editorial corrections, apparently made by Lenin when preparing to have the book published abroad.

The text of What the "Friends of the People" Are published in the present edition conforms to the text of the hectographed copy acquired by the Institute in 1936, account being taken of the corrections made. According to the authorised copy, inverted commas have been replaced in some passages by italics, while a number of interpolations that were in brackets in the text have been given as footnotes. Lenin's explanation to the table (Appendix I), omitted from previous editions, is also given.

v) Segunda parte aún no ha sido hallada

The second part of the book has still not been found.

Primera Parte

Lenin demuestra haber leído "Doctrinas económicas de Marx" de Kautsky (1887)

In this connection one cannot help recalling the very apt epigraph Kautsky selected for his book on the economic teachings of Marx;

Wer wird nicht einen Klopstock loben?
Doch wird ihn jeder lesen? Nein.
Wir wollen weniger erhoben,
Und fleissiger gelesen sein!*
* Who would not praise a Klopstock? But will everybody read him? No. We would like to be exalted less, but read more diligently! (Lessing).

Premisas conceptuales y epistemológicas (contra el populismo de Mikhailovsky) –"Esqueleto de El Capital"

i) Ley de movimiento contra escisión espuria entre naturaleza y sociedad (historicismo)

"'... It is the ultimate aim of this work, to lay bare the law of development (in the original: das oekonomische Bewegungsgesetz— the economic law of motion) of modern society,' Karl Marx says in reference to his Capital

In what sense, then, does Marx speak of the economic law of motion of society, even referring to this law as a Naturgesetz—a law of nature? How are we to understand this, when so many of our native sociologists have covered reams of paper to show that social phenomena are particularly distinct from the phenomena of natural history, and that therefore the investigation of the former requires the employment of an absolutely distinct "subjective method in sociology."

i.i) Ley de movimiento de una formación económico-social (como modo de producción epocal, mpc)

…passages just quoted from the Preface…First let us note two circumstances regarding all this: Marx speaks of one "economic formation of society" only, the capitalist formation,

that is, he says that he investigated the law of development of this formation only and of no other.

First let us note two circumstances regarding all this: Marx speaks of one "economic formation of society" only, the capitalist formation, that is, he says that he investigated the law of development of this formation only and of no other.

i.ii) Contra el fetiche de la sociedad en general

I have already pointed out that from the standpoint of the old (not old for Russia) economists and sociologists, the concept of the economic formation of society is entirely superfluous: they talk of society in general, they argue with the Spencers about the nature of society in general, about the aim and essence of society in general, and so forth.

i.iii) Contra el discurso de los derechos

In their reasonings, these subjective sociologists rely on arguments such as—the aim of society is to benefit all its members, that justice, therefore, demands such and such an organisation, and that a system that is out of harmony with this ideal organisation ("Sociology must start with some utopia"—these words of Mr. Mikhailovsky's

i.iv) Contra el humanismo y la consideración del mpc como excepcional/anormal a la Kautsky-Hyndman

…is abnormal and should be set aside. "The essential task of sociology," Mr. Mikhailovsky, for instance, argues, "is to ascertain the social conditions under which any particular requirement of human nature is satisfied." As you see, what interests this sociologist is only a society that satisfies human nature, and not at all some strange formations of society, which, moreover, may be based on a phenomenon so out of harmony with "human nature" as the enslavement of the majority by the minority

i. v) Contra el normativismo, moralismo y el voluntarismo (subjetivismo)

("Having accepted something as desirable or undesirable, the sociologist must discover the conditions under which the desirable can be realised, or the undesirable eliminated"—"under which such and such ideals can be realised"—this same Mr. Mikhailovsky reasons.) What is more, there can be no talk even of development, but only of various deviations from the "desirable," of "defects" that have occurred in history as a result ... as a result of the fact that people were not clever enough, were unable properly to understand what human nature demands, were unable to discover the conditions for the realisation of such a rational system…the very root of this childish morality which lays claim to the title of sociology

ii) Relevamiento enfático de la determinancia de las relaciones de producción (y citando El Prefacio de 1859)

By what means did Marx arrive at this basic idea? He did so by singling out the economic sphere from the various spheres of social life, by singling out production relations from all social relations as being basic, primary, determining all other relations

> *"The first work which I undertook for a solution of the doubts which assailed me was a critical review of the Hegelian philosophy of right....My investigation led to the result that legal relations as well as forms of state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so-called general development of the human mind, but rather have their roots in the material conditions of life, the sum-total of which Hegel, following the example of the Englishmen and Frenchmen of the eighteenth century, combines under the name of 'civil society,' that, however, the anatomy of civil society is to be sought in political economy.... The general result at which I arrived ... can be briefly formulated as follows: in the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations ... relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum-total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general….Then begins an epoch of social revolution….In considering such transformations, a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the conditions of production, which should be established in terms of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in short, ideological— forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out"* (Marx, Preface 1859)

Lenin da el párrafo completo y es él el que subraya relaciones de producción

ii.i) Relaciones de producción fueron una prenoción que se probó como correcta para desarrollar el materialismo

This idea of materialism in sociology was in itself a stroke of genius. Naturally, for the time being it was only a hypothesis, but one which first created the possibility of a strictly scientific approach to historical and social problems

ii.ii) Sociólogos que estudian superestructura son necesariamente rousseanianos (crítica racionalismo, consensualismo, etc)

...the sociologists undertook the direct investigation and study of political and legal forms, stumbled on the fact that these forms emerge from certain of mankind's ideas in the period in question—and there they stopped; it appeared as if social relations are consciously established by men. But this conclusion, fully expressed in the idea of the Contrat social (traces of which are very noticeable in all systems of utopian socialism), was in complete contradiction to all historical observations

Crítica a las teorías del consenso rousseanianas, sobre todo por su ilusión racionalista y voluntarista (subjetivista). Lenin descubre la semilla de Habermas desarrollada en unos populistas que tienen su base en Rousseau.

Recordemos que los marxistas de la época, tanto los revolucionarios como Lafargue como los reformistas como Hyndman, toman y se basan en Rousseau

ii.iii) Materialismo basado en Darwin (énfasis en la adaptación)

It never has been the case, nor is it so now, that the members of society conceive the sum-total of the social relations in which they live as something definite, integral, pervaded by some principle; on the contrary, the mass of people adapt themselves to these relations unconsciously, and have so little conception of them as specific historical social relations that, for instance, an explanation of the exchange relations under which people have lived for centuries was found only in very recent times.

ii.iv) Ilustrados franceses no son materialistas como para Plejanov

Materialism removed this contradiction by carrying the analysis deeper, to the origin of man's social ideas themselves; and its conclusion that the course of ideas depends on the course of things is the only one compatible with scientific psychology.

ii.v) No son parte de la superestructura ni están sujetas a la voluntad (objetivas y pasan por encima de las cabezas de los agentes)

Materialism provided an absolutely objective criterion by singling out "production relations" as the structure of society, and by making it possible to apply to these relations that general scientific criterion of recurrence whose applicability to sociology the subjectivists denied. So long as they confined themselves to ideological social relations (i.e., such as, before taking shape, pass through man's consciousness*) they could not observe recurrence and regularity in the social phenomena of the various countries, and their science was at best only a description of these phenomena, a collection of raw material. The analysis of material social relations (i.e., of those that take shape without passing through man's consciousness: when exchanging products men enter into production relations without even realising that there is a social relation of production here)

ii.vi) Llevan necesariamente al análisis concreto (formación social, análisis de países, etc)

…the analysis of material social relations at once made it possible to observe recurrence and regularity and to generalise the systems of the various countries in the single fundamental concept: social formation. It was this generalisation alone that made it possible to proceed from the description of social phenomena (and their evaluation from the standpoint of an ideal) to their strictly scientific analysis, which isolates, let us say by way of example, that which distinguishes one capitalist country from another and investigates that which is common to all of them.

iii) Determinancia de las ffpp formulada de manera no tecnologicista

Thirdly, and finally, another reason why this hypothesis for the first time made a scientific sociology possible was that only the reduction of social relations to production relations and of the latter to the level of the productive forces provided a firm basis for the conception that the development of formations of society is a process of natural history

iv) Del mpms al mpc y la necesaria lucha de clases entre proletariado y burguesía

He took one of the social-economic formations— the system of commodity production…This analysis is confined exclusively to production relations between members of society: without ever resorting to features outside the sphere of these production relations for an explanation, Marx makes it possible to discern how the commodity organisation of social economy develops, how it becomes transformed into capitalist organisation, creating antagonistic classes (antagonistic within the bounds of production relations), the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, how it develops the productivity of social labour, and thereby introduces an element that becomes irreconcilably contradictory to the foundations of this capitalist organisation itself.

"Una" formación económico-social, la sociedad moderna: de ahí que Lenin no considere al mpms como un modo de producción epocal ni tampoco como con una existencia independiente (por más que de a entender que existió históricamente)
A diferencia de Plejanov, la contradicción estructural básica (objetiva y que en alguna medida pasa por encima de las cabezas de los agentes) es la lucha de clases. Lenin no es subjetivista, pero corrige el "naturalismo" de Plejanov, esto al derivar de su énfasis en las rrpp la primacía de la lucha de clases

Caracterización de El Capital

i) Basado en el análisis de las rrpp y con un énfasis en la lucha de clases que lleva a la superestructura y la crítica al discurso de los derechos

Such is the skeleton of Capital. The whole point, however, is that Marx did not content himself with this skeleton, that he did not confine himself to “economic theory” in the ordinary sense of the term, that, while explaining the structure and development of the given formation of society exclusively through production relations, he nevertheless everywhere and incessantly scrutinised the superstructure corresponding to these production relations and clothed the skeleton in flesh and blood. The reason Capital has enjoyed such tremendous success is that this book by a “German economist” showed the whole capitalist social formation to the reader as a living thing—with its everyday aspects, with the actual social manifestation of the class antagonism inherent in production relations, with the bourgeois political superstructure that protects the rule of the capitalist class, with the bourgeois ideas of liberty, equality and so forth, with the bourgeois family relationships

ii) Analogía con Darwin es correcta (referencia a leyes y naturaleza no lleva necesariamente al evlucionismo y al mecanicismo)

It will now be clear that the comparison with Darwin is perfectly accurate: Capital…Just as Darwin put an end to the view of animal and plant species being unconnected, fortuitous, "created by God" and immutable, and was the first to put biology on an absolutely scientific basis by establishing the mutability and the succession of species, so Marx put an end to the view of society being a mechanical aggregation of individuals which allows of all sorts of modification at the will of the authorities (or, if you like, at the will of society and the government) and which emerges and changes casually, and was the first to put sociology on a scientific basis by establishing the concept of the economic formation of society as the sum-total of given production relations, by establishing the fact that the development of such formations is a process of natural history.

Y justamente la comparación con Darwin, que en general se tiene como un énfasis natuarlista-evolucionista, es lo que permite a Lenin superar la dicotomía historia/naturaleza, superar tanto el histocirismo como el mecanicismo. Recordemos que M y E vieron a Darwin de forma similar en sus cartas (un historizador antiteleológico de la naturaleza), y que esta comparación de Lenin entre Marx y Darwin lleva agua a la tesis de que el primero no era fatalista-inevitabilista como Kautsky...

iii) "Formación social" no es un "país" o "pueblo", superando la dicotomía neokantiana entre modo de producción y formación

And until we get some other attempt to give a scientific explanation of the functioning and development of some formation of society—formation of society, mind you, and not the way of life of some country or people, or even class, etc.—another attempt just as capable of introducing order into the "pertinent facts" as materialism is, that is just as capable of presenting a living picture of a definite formation, while giving it a strictly scientific explanation

iv) El método de El Capital fraseado como "modelo"

He has read Capital and failed to notice that he had before him a model of scientific, materialist analysis of one—the most complex—formation of society, a model recognised by all and surpassed by none

v) No es "todista" (investiga el mpc pero su método debe aplicarse a modos de producción distintos, desarrollo programa de investigación)

(…) He quotes a passage from Blos to the effect that Marx proclaimed an entirely new conception of history, and without further ado goes on to declare that this theory claims to have "explained to mankind its past," to have explained "the whole (sic!!?) past of mankind," and so on. But this is utterly false! The theory only claims to explain the capitalist social organisation, and no other… it is quite natural that the necessity for such a method extends to other social formations, even though they have not been subjected to special factual investigation and detailed analysis… so materialism in history has never claimed to explain everything, but merely to indicate the "only scientific," to use Marx's expression (Capital), method of explaining history… Mr. Mikhailovsky when he first

misrepresents Marx by ascribing to materialism in history the absurd claims of “explaining everything,” of finding “the key to all historical locks” (claims which were, of course, refuted by Marx immediately and in very biting style in his “Letter” on Mikhailovsky’s articles)

Lenin primero refuta el supuesto abstractismo de El Capital (igual que Engels en "Sobre la cuestión de la vivienda"), y aquí el supuesto mito de éste como solucionador y explicador de todo. Y en ello no cae en el particularismo especifista, caro a los populistas. Asimismo, pone énfasis también en el método y en el programa de investigación (éste debe aplicarse a formaciones no capitalistas, previas).
Lenin más que conoce Letter to otechestvenniye zapiski (Marx, nov 1877)

Las raíces del materialismo basado en la relaciones de producción (Manifiesto Comunista y Miseria de la Filosofía)

He has read the Communist Manifesto and failed to notice that the explanation it gives of modern systems—legal, political, family, religious and philosophical—is a materialist one, and that even the criticism of the socialist and communist theories seeks and finds their roots in such and such production relations.

He has read The Poverty of Philosophy and failed to notice that its analysis of Proudhon’s sociology is made from the materialist standpoint, that the criticism of the solution propounded by Proudhon for the most diverse historical problems is based on the principles of materialism, and that the author’s own indications as to where the data for the solution of these problems are to be sought all amount to references to production relations.

A diferencia de Guesde, Bax, Hyndman (y el Bernstein de los 1891-195) Lenin afirma y defiende explícitamente un punto de vista materialista de modo enfático...
Coincidente con su énfasis en las rrpp, Lenin enfatiza en Miseria de la Filosofía, el escrito que entroniza y funda la categoría rrpp. El Plejanov fértil también pone algún énfasis en este libro de 1847, mientras su deriva filo-menchevique de 1893 lo omite y enfatiza en mayor medida el humanismo de la La Sagrada Familia (precisamente un escrito en que Proudhon es celebrado y no criticado...)

Lenin contra los fetiches de la sociología

i) Contra la entronización del factor económico de Kareyev

But Mr. Mikhailovsky will probably learn of Marx’s materialist investigations only when they are classified and properly indexed in some sophistical work on history by some Kareyev under the heading “Economic Materialism.”

Crítica a Kareyev, el cual Marx discute mediante crítica amigable en su carta de 1879 y que Engels de alguna manera recomienda como lectura a Kautsky en 1889 sobre la

RF...Lenin contra el énfasis en el "factor económico", pero permaneciendo sumamente materialista y con énfasis en las rrpp

ii) Contra la problemática de la sociedad y el progreso propia d ela metafísica (igul que la crítica de Plejanov)

…theories of the historical process… abstract discourses on: what is society, what is progress?... unrelieved metaphysics. For, to begin by asking what is society and what is progress

iii) El problema de la "sociedad" es una forma burguesa y pequeñoburguesa de definir y abordar la cuestión

In the same way, of course, neither is Capital the appropriate work for a metaphysician-sociologist who does not realise the sterility of a priori arguments about the nature of society and does not understand that such methods, instead of contributing to a study and elucidation of the problem, only serve to insinuate into the concept "society" either the bourgeois ideas of the British shopkeeper or the pettybourgeois socialist ideals of the Russian democrat—and nothing more. That is why all these theories of the philosophy of history arose and burst like soap-bubbles, being at best a symptom of the social ideas and relations of their time, and not advancing one hair's breadth man's understanding of even a few, but real, social relations (and not such as "harmonise with human nature").

Sobre "La Ideología Alemana"

i) Para Engels aún mostraba el gran desconocimiento de él y Marx respecto del objeto tratado (citado por Mikhailovsky)

> *Engels says: 'The finished portion [of this work] consists of an exposition of the materialist conception of history which proves only how incomplete our knowledge of economic history still was at that time.'* (Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach y el nacimiento de la filosofía clásica alemana, 1888)

ii) Para Mikhaislovsky la afirmación de Engels sirve para desligitimar El Manifiesto como no científico

The kind and quality of Mr. Mikhailovsky's twisting may be seen from the following example: "Marx nowhere substantiates them"—i.e., the foundations of the theory of economic materialism—says Mr. Mikhailovsky. "True, Marx and Engels thought of writing a work dealing with the history of philosophy and the philosophy of history, and even did write one (in 1845-1846), but it was never published. Engels says: 'The finished portion [of this work] consists of an exposition of the materialist conception of history which proves only how incomplete our knowledge of economic history still was at that time.' Thus," concludes Mr. Mikhailovsky, "the fundamental points of 'scientific socialism' and of the theory of economic materialism were discovered, and were then expounded in the Manifesto, at a time when, as one of the authors himself admits, they were poorly equipped with the knowledge needed for such a work."

iii) Para Lenin la afirmación de Engels es muestra de la gran conciencia cientúfica de M y E (el marxismo como programa de investigación en desarrollo)

The decision by Marx and Engels not to publish their work on the history of philosophy and to concentrate all their efforts on a scientific analysis of one social organisation is only indicative of a very high degree of scientific conscientiousness. Mr. Mikhailovsky's decision to twist this by the little addition that Marx and Engels expounded their views while themselves confessing that their knowledge was inadequate to elaborate them, is only indicative of methods of controversy which testify neither to intellect nor to a sense of decency

Sobre el método del populista Mikhailovsky

i) Crítica a El capital como "demasiado abstracto"

"at the end of the forties an absolutely new, materialist and truly scientific conception of history was discovered and proclaimed, and it did for historical science what Darwin's theory did for modern natural science." But this conception—Mr. Mikhailovsky once more repeats—was never scientifically substantiated. "Not only was it never tested in a large and varied field of factual material"

i) Lenin y la crítica a Duhring de Engels como apicable al populista Mikhailovsky y su énfasis en la "fuerza"

Engels' book—Herrn E. Dührings Umwälzung der Wissenschaft... and despite the fact that this work contains a detailed criticism of the "force theory," which asserts that political and legal systems determine economic systems and is so zealously professed by the gentlemen who write in Russkoye Bogatstvo

iii) Contra la entronización del factor económico (una forma de resolver la diferencia entre El Capital y El origen de la familia...)

Secondly—argues our philosopher— procreation is not an economic factor. But where have you read in the works of Marx or Engels that they necessarily spoke of economic materialism? When they described their world outlook they called it simply materialism. Their basic idea (quite definitely expressed, for instance, in the passage from Marx quoted above) was that social relations are divided into material and ideological. The latter merely constitute a superstructure on the former, which take shape independent of the will and consciousness of man as (the result) the form of man's activity to maintain his existence

Lenin contra el enmarcamiento de la problemática marxista bajo la terminología del "factor económico" (recordemos que este procedimiento es crucial para Samir Amin, así como también en parte de la interpretación de Perry Anderson los modos precapitalistas

Lenin, en cambio, pone el centro en el materialismo, al cual no entroniza como histórico, sno que habla de un método histórico-natural (Plejanov, en cambio, pone el acento en el materailismo dialéctico). La plena demarcación entre uno y otro aún no es clara...

iv) El énfasis del populismo en la herencia (familia) y su necesario contenido burgués como método de análisis

…but with a certain amount of dialectical dexterity it might be shown that not only legal, but also economic relations themselves constitute a 'superstructure' on sexual and family relations. We shall not dwell on this, but nevertheless would at least point to the institution of inheritance."

Until now everybody thought that if, for instance, in the era when the fief system flourished in Russia, the land was not transmissible by inheritance (because it was regarded as conditional property only), the explanation was to be sought in the peculiarities of the social organisation of the time

Scratch the "friend of the people"—we may say, paraphrasing the familiar saying—and you will find a bourgeois. Really, what other meaning can attach to Mr. Mikhailovsky's reflections on the connection between the institution of inheritance and the upbringing of children, the psychology of procreation, and so on, except that the institution of inheritance is just as eternal, essential and sacred as the upbringing of children?

The fief (pomestye) system—the specific system of feudal landownership that arose and became firmly established in Russia in the fifteenth, and particularly the sixteenth century. The fief system was closely bound up with the formation of a centralised state and the establishment of a centralised army. The fief lands, considered the property of the feudal ruler, were distributed by the government among those who served in the armed forces or at court. The amount of land received depended on the duties of the landholder. The fief, as distinct from the votchina, the absolute and hereditary landed property of the boyar, was the conditional and temporary property of a nobleman who had rendered these services. From the middle of the sixteenth century the fief was gradually transformed into an hereditary estate, and increasingly approximated to the votchina. In the seventeenth century the difference between these two forms of feudal landownership disappeared, and the feudal rights of votchina and fief owners became identical. Following Peter I's ukase on inheritance issued in 1714 the fief once and for all became the private property of the landed nobility. The term fief (pomestye) continued to be used in Russia throughout the entire feudal epoch.

v) Contra el trasplante de categorías sociológicas modernas al precapitalismo (contra la familia como origen de la historia humana, Engels de "El origen…")

Mr. Mikhailovsky, evidently, borrows his ideas on the history of society from the tales taught to school children. The history of society—this copybook maxim runs—is that first there was the family, that nucleus of every society,* then—we are told—the family grew into the tribe, and the tribe grew into the state.

(Nota al pie) This is a purely bourgeois idea: separate, small families came to predominate only under the bourgeois regime; they were entirely non-existent in prehistoric times. Nothing is more characteristic of the bourgeois than the application of the features of the modern system to all times and peoples.

Crítica a la primacía histórica y lógica de la familia para explicar la realidad material. Lenin contra Bourdieau y la sociología que opone tradición y comunidad a sociedad y modernidad (contra el mito armónico propio de la sociedades precapitalistas y hasta prehistóricas...

vi) Contra la hipótesis del comunismo primitivo (el gens ruso ya fue eliminado durante la Edad- era de los zares moscovitas)

While one might speak of gentile life in ancient Rus, there can be no doubt that by the Middle Ages, the era of the Moscovite tsars, these gentile ties no longer existed, that is to say, the state was based on associations that were not gentile at all, but local: the landlords and the monasteries acquired peasants from various localities, and the communities thus formed were purely territorial associations. But one could hardly speak of national ties in the true sense of the term at that time: the state split into separate "lands," sometimes even principalities, which preserved strong traces of the former autonomy, peculiarities of administration, at times their own troops (the local boyars went to war at the head of their own companies), their own tariff frontiers, and so forth.

vii) Contra la tesis de una Rusia semifeudal en lo actual

But one could hardly speak of national ties in the true sense of the term at that time: the state split into separate "lands," sometimes even principalities, which preserved strong traces of the former autonomy, peculiarities of administration, at times their own troops (the local boyars went to war at the head of their own companies), their own tariff frontiers, and so forth. Only the modern period of Russian history (approximately from the seventeenth century) is characterised by the actual amalgamation of all such regions, lands and principalities into one whole. *This amalgamation, most esteemed Mr. Mikhailovsky, was brought about not by gentile ties, nor even by their continuation and generalisation: it was brought about by the increasing exchange among regions, the gradually growing circulation of commodities, and the concentration of the small local markets into a single, all-Russian market. Since the leaders and masters of this process were the merchant capitalists, the creation of these national ties was nothing else than the creation of bourgeois ties*

Lenin y una tesis enfática contra la teoría del semifeudalismo ruso. Al igual que Trotsky en Balance y Perspectivas, conceptualiza el nacimiento del capitalismo ruso en el s XVII, al cual suma los inicios de Estado moderno (no una superestructura asiática)

viii) Lucha de clases e internacionalismo contra la bandera del intercambio justo de Mikhailovsky

He wants, for instance, to refute the thesis that history is a succession of episodes of the class struggle, and so, declaring with an air of profundity that this is "extreme," he says… Of course, if the nec plus ultra of international solidarity is to be seen in a system of "fair" exchange, on which the chronicler of home affairs expatiates with philistine banality in No.

2 of Russkoye Bogatstvo, and if it is not understood that exchange, fair or unfair, always presupposes and includes the rule of the bourgeoisie, and that the cessation of international clashes is impossible unless the economic organisation based on exchange is destroyed, then it is understandable that there should be nothing but sneers for the International. Then one can understand that Mr. Mikhailovsky cannot grasp the simple truth that there is no other way of combating national hatred than by organizing and uniting the oppressed class for a struggle against the oppressor class in each separate country, than by uniting such national working-class organisations into a single international working-class army to fight international capital

Lenin contra el la tesis semifeudal, el populismo especifista y el humanismo

Marx found it impossible to content himself with such a socialism. He did not confine himself to describing the existing system, to judging it and condemning it; **he gave a scientific explanation of it, reducing that existing system, which differs in the different European and non-European countries, to a common basis—the capitalist social formation, the laws of the functioning and development of which he subjected to an objective analysis** (**he showed the necessity of exploitation under that system**). In just the same way he did not find it possible to content himself with asserting that only the socialist system harmonises with human nature, as was claimed by the great utopian socialists and by their wretched imitators, the subjective sociologists.

Lenin contra la tesis del capitalismo en un solo país, contra la división espuria entre occidente y Asia, contra la idea de que las leyes del mpc son solo propias de occidente, contra la tesis semifeudal para interpretar a la Rusia de su época.
Lenin y el centro puesto en la explotación. Lenin contra el humanismo (el capitalismo también es humano) -igual que Marx en la Circular a Kriege y en la crítica a Heinzen

Sobre el problema del determinismo, voluntad y acción

i) Mikhailovsky repite la misma crítica de Ernst de 1890 ("el marxismo es un estructuralismo burdo que no deja nada a la acción individual")

He speaks of "the conflict between the idea of historical necessity and the significance of individual activity": socially active figures err in regarding themselves as active, when as a matter of fact they are "activated," "marionettes, manipulated from a mysterious underground by the immanent laws of historical necessity"— such, he claims, is the conclusion to be drawn from this idea, which he therefore characterises as "sterile" and "diffuse." Probably not every reader knows where Mr. Mikhailovsky got all this nonsense about marionettes and the like. The point is that this is one of the favourite hobby-horses of the subjective philosopher—the idea of the conflict between determinism and morality, between historical necessity and the significance of the individual

ii) Determinismo supone determinar las condiciones para que la acción de los individuos pueda ser efectiva y eficaz (caracterización y planificación)

Actually, there is no conflict here at all; it has been invented by Mr. Mikhailovsky, who feared (not without reason) that determinism would cut the ground from under the philistine morality he loves so dearly. The idea of determinism, which postulates that human acts are necessitated and rejects the absurd tale about free will, in no way destroys man's reason or conscience, or appraisal of his actions. Quite the contrary, only the determinist view makes a strict and correct appraisal possible instead of attributing everything you please to free will. Similarly, the idea of historical necessity does not in the least undermine the role of the individual in history: all history is made up of the actions of individuals, who are undoubtedly active figures. The real question that arises in appraising the social activity of an individual is: what conditions ensure the success of his actions, what guarantee is there that these actions will not remain an isolated act lost in a welter of contrary acts?

iii) Caracterización y análisis de clases–nuestra concepción de estrategia (Rusia es una sociedad burguesa, no semifeudal)

…question answered differently by Social-Democrats and by the other Russian socialists: how must actions aimed at bringing about the socialist system attract the masses in order to yield serious fruits? Obviously, the answer to this question depends directly and immediately on the way in which the grouping of social forces in Russia and the class struggle which forms the substance of Russian reality are understood… The Social-Democratic answer to the question is based, as we know, on the view that the Russian economic system constitutes a bourgeois society, from which there can be only one way out, the one that necessarily follows from the very nature of the bourgeois system, namely, the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Obviously, criticism that is serious should be directed either against the view that ours is a bourgeois system, or against the conception of the nature of this system and the laws of its development

Y la caracterización es definida, clara y enfática. Rusia es una sociedad burguesa, no semifeudal. se mueve por la contradicción clasista entre obreros y burgueses, no por las cuestiones asiáticas, zaristas, nobiliarias, semifeudales, etc

iv) Oposición populista espuria entre "masa" y "líderes", sobre el problema de dirección

This outer shell, which hides the really serious and burning questions of the day, is Mr. Mikhailovsky's favourite sphere, and with particular pride he stresses the point, for example, that "economic materialism ignores or throws a wrong light on the question of heroes and the crowd." Pray note—the question which are the conflicting classes that make up contemporary Russian reality and what is its basis, is probably too general for Mr. Mikhailovsky, and he evades it. On the other hand, the question of what relations exist between the hero and the crowd—whether it is a crowd of workers, peasants, factory owners, or landlords, is one that interests him extremely. Maybe these questions are "interesting," but to rebuke the materialists for devoting all their efforts to the settlement of problems that directly concern the liberation of the labouring class is to be an admirer of philistine science, nothing more

Lenin y una crítica clasista enfática a una de las temáticas favoritas del populismo (sobre todo en su variante subjetivista): la relación masa-líder. Lenin contra la versión sociologizante de la teoría crítica que emerge desde los 1920s. Lenin contra la forma populista que adopta esta temática en manos de Lunacharsky y Bogdanov. Lenin sobre un rechazo a una versión deformada del problema de dirección (muy similar a los apuntes sobre el problema de dirección que Engels desarrolla en "Revolución y Contrarrevolución en Alemania"
Lenin, igual que Trosky, en contra la entronización del concepto masas, las cuales concibe pueden ser burguesas y capitalistas (contra la minorización de la clase dominante).
La relación masa-líder no toca las preguntas clasistas centrales que conciernen la destrucción de la sociedad de clases capitalista

El Capital no como dirigido a burgueses que se dan aires científicos (Lenin contra el Kautsky de 1887)

Mr. Mikhailovsky says: "Marx did not have this particular circle of readers" (workers) "in view, but expected something from men of science too." That is absolutely untrue. Marx understood very well how little impartiality and scientific criticism he could expect from the bourgeois scientists and in the Afterword to the second edition of Capital he expressed himself very definitely on this score

Contra el economicismo: desarrollo desigual y combinado entre base y superestructura rescatando al "Marx joven"

…the materialists (Marxists) were the first socialists to raise the issue of the need to analyse all aspects of social life, and not only the economic*—
* This has been quite clearly expressed in Capital and in the tactics of the Social-Democrats, as compared with the earlier socialists. Marx directly demanded that matters must not be confined to the economic aspect. In 1843, when drafting the programme for a projected magazine, Marx wrote to Ruge:

> *"The whole socialist principle is again only one aspect.... We, on our part, must devote equal attention to the other aspect, the theoretical existence of man, and consequently must make religion, science, and so forth an object of our criticism.... Just as religion represents the table of contents of the theoretical conflicts of mankind, the political state represents the table of contents of man's practical conflicts. Thus, the political state, within the limits of its form expresses sub specie rei publicae (from the political standpoint) all social conflicts, needs and interests. Hence to make a most special political question—e.g., the difference between the social-estate system and the representative system— an object of criticism by no means implies descending from the hauteur des principes (the height of principles.—Ed.) since this question expresses in political language the difference between the rule of man and the rule of private property. This means that the critic not only may but must deal with these political questions (which the inveterate socialist considers unworthy of attention)."*

And the whole socialist principle in its turn is only one aspect that concerns the reality of the true human being. But we have to pay just as much attention to the other aspect, to the theoretical existence of man, and therefore to make religion, science, etc., the object of our criticism. In addition, we want to influence our contemporaries, particularly our German contemporaries. The question arises: how are we to set about it? There are two kinds of facts which are undeniable. In the first place religion, and next to it, politics, are the subjects which form the main interest of Germany today. We must take these, in whatever form they exist, as our point of departure, and not confront them with some ready-made system such as, for example, the Voyage en Icarie. [Etienne Cabet, Voyage en Icarie. Roman philosophique et social.]

Reason has always existed, but not always in a reasonable form. The critic can therefore start out from any form of theoretical and practical consciousness and from the forms peculiar to existing reality develop the true reality as its obligation and its final goal. As far as real life is concerned, it is precisely the political state – in all its modern forms – which, even where it is not yet consciously imbued with socialist demands, contains the demands of reason. And the political state does not stop there. Everywhere it assumes that reason has been realised. But precisely because of that it everywhere becomes involved in the contradiction between its ideal function and its real prerequisites.

From this conflict of the political state with itself, therefore, it is possible everywhere to develop the social truth. Just as religion is a register of the theoretical struggles of mankind, so the political state is a register of the practical struggles of mankind. Thus, the political state expresses, within the limits of its form sub specie rei publicae, [as a particular kind of state] all social struggles, needs and truths. Therefore, to take as the object of criticism a most specialised political question – such as the difference between a system based on social estate and one based on representation – is in no way below the hauteur des principes. [Level of principles] For this question only expresses in a political way the difference between rule by man and rule by private property. Therefore the critic not only can, but must deal with these political questions (which according to the extreme Socialists are altogether unworthy of attention). In analysing the superiority of the representative system over the social-estate system, the critic in a practical way wins the interest of a large party. By raising the representative system from its political form to the universal form and by bringing out the true significance underlying this system, the critic at the same time compels this party to go beyond its own confines, for its victory is at the same time its defeat (Marx to Ruge, Kreuznach, sept 1843 (v 3 de la MECW)

Lenin cita de forma algo mañosa para eliminar el rastro humanista del primer Marx (lo cual tiene el rasgo positivo de que se opone al humanismo, pero también el negativo en que no ve el marxismo como programa de investigación en desarrollo)

Resumen de la tesis marxistas de Lenin hasta aquí (método materialista, relaciones de producción, histórico-natural, etc)

If we were to ask anybody at all what objections Mr. Mikhailovsky has raised against the view that production relations form the basis of all others; how he has refuted the correctness of the concept of the social formation and of the natural-historical development of these formations elaborated by Marx using the materialist method

El fetiche de la complejidad para criticar al marxismo y el análisis del populismo subjetivista

He starts out by holding forth on the ‘’complexity’’ of social life:…

Sobre la dialéctica

i) Origen de la triada hegeliana en Proclus, rescatada por Schelling, Fichte y Hegel

Triad (Greek, trias)—in philosophy it is the formula of threestage development. The idea of three-stage development was first formulated by the Greek Neo-Platonic philosophers, particularly by Proclus, and was expressed in the works of the German idealist philosophers Fichte and Schelling. The triad was, however, developed most fully in the idealist philosophy of Hegel, who considered that every process of development traverses three stages—thesis, antithesis, and synthesis

ii) Mikhailovsky se queja de la sofistería nebulosa de la tríada hegeliana marxista (igual que Duhring)

And so, the materialists rest their case on the "incontrovertibility" of the dialectical process! In other words, they base their sociological theories on Hegelian triads

iii) Lenin y el Anti-Duhring: la dialéctica no es mero coqueteo fraseológico con una tradición intelectual que no hace al contenido de la cuestión

…these gentlemen fastened on Marx's manner of expression and attacked the origin of the theory, thinking thereby to undermine its essence… Anti-Dühring as a pretext. Replying to Dühring, who had attacked Marx's dialectics, Engels says that Marx never dreamed of "proving" anything by means of Hegelian triads, that Marx only studied and investigated the real process, and that the sole criterion of theory recognised by him was its conformity to reality. If, however, it sometimes happened that the development of some particular social phenomenon fitted in with the Hegelian scheme, namely, thesis—negation—negation of the negation, there is nothing surprising about that, for it is no rare thing in nature at all.

iv) No es la mera selección arbitraria de casos para probar una forma modélica

And Engels proceeds to cite examples from natural history (the development of a seed) and the social sphere—as, for instance, that first there was primitive communism, then private property, and then the capitalist socialization of labour; or that first there was primitive materialism, then idealism, and then scientific materialism, and so forth. It is clear to everybody that the main weight of Engels' argument is that materialists must correctly and accurately depict the actual historical process, and that insistence on dialectics, the selection of examples to demonstrate the correctness of the triad, is nothing but a relic of the Hegelianism out of which scientific socialism has grown, a relic of its manner of expression. And, indeed, once it has been categorically declared that to "prove" anything by triads is absurd, and that nobody even thought of doing so, what significance can attach to examples of "dialectical" processes? Is it not obvious that this merely points to the origin of the doctrine and nothing more?

v) Dialéctica materialista para Lenin (desarrollo o movimiento a estudiar científicamente, relacionismo, antimecanicismo para vincular instancias de la totalidad, determinación por las rrpp)

…he took it for granted that this method consists in solving all sociological problems in accordance with the laws of the Hegelian triad. Had he been just a little more attentive to the matter in hand he could not but have become convinced of the absurdity of this notion. What Marx and Engels called the dialectical method—as against the metaphysical—is nothing else than the scientific method in sociology, which consists in regarding society as a living organism in a state of constant development (and not as something mechanically concatenated and therefore permitting all sorts of arbitrary combinations of separate social elements), an organism the study of which requires an objective analysis of the production relations that constitute the given social formation and an investigation of its laws of functioning and development… anyone who reads the definition and description of the dialectical method given either by Engels (in the polemic against Dühring: Socialism: Utopian and Scientific) or by Marx (various comments in Capital, in the Afterword to the second edition, and in The Poverty of Philosophy) will see that the Hegelian triads are not even mentioned, and that it all amounts to regarding social evolution as the natural historical process of development of socialeconomic formations

vi) Interpretación del Afterword de El Capital de 1872-3

"German reviews, of course, shriek out at 'Hegelian sophistics'." And in order to illustrate his method more clearly, Marx quotes the description of it given in the article mentioned

vi.i) Leyes de movimiento sincrónicas que dan lugar a cambio diacrónico

The one thing of importance to Marx, it is there stated, is to find the law governing the phenomena he is investigating, and of particular importance to him is the law of change, the development of those phenomena, of their transition from one form into another, from one order of social relations to another. Consequently, Marx is concerned with one thing only: to show, by rigid scientific investigation, the necessity of the given order of social relations, and to establish, as fully as possible, the facts that serve him as fundamental points of departure. For this purpose it is quite enough if, while proving the necessity of the present order of things, he at the same time proves the necessity of another order which must inevitably grow out

vi.ii) Rechazo al materialismo ilustrado metafísico (basado en la división espuria entre naturaleza y sociedad)

…of the preceding one regardless of whether men believe in it or not, whether they are conscious of it or not. Marx treats the social movement as a process of natural history, governed by laws not only independent of human will, consciousness and intentions, but, rather, on the contrary, determining the will, consciousness and intentions of men. (This for the information of the subjectivist gentlemen, who separate social evolution from the evolution of natural history merely because man sets himself conscious "aims" and is guided by definite ideals.)

vi.iii) Método debe ser objetivista y no enfatizar en lo que los hombres piensan de sí mismos

If the conscious element plays so subordinate a part in the history of civilisation, it is selfevident that a critique whose subject is civilisation, can least of all take as its basis any form of, or any result of, consciousness. That is to say, that not the idea, but the external, objective phenomenon alone can serve as its point of departure.

vi.iv) Fases, relacionismo y estudio científico cabal

Criticism must consist in comparing and contrasting the given fact with another fact and not with the idea; the one thing of moment is that both facts be investigated as accurately as possible, and that they actually form, in respect of each other, different moments of development; but most important of all is that an equally accurate investigation be made of the whole series of known states, their sequence and the relation between the different stages of development.

vi.vi) Analogía biologocista en Lenin

Marx rejects the very idea that the laws of economic life are one and the same for the past and the present. On the contrary, every historical period has its own laws. Economic life constitutes a phenomenon analogous to the history of evolution in other branches of biology. Earlier economists misunderstood the nature of economic laws when they likened them to the laws of physics and chemistry. A more thorough analysis shows that social organisms differ among themselves as fundamentally as plants or animals…. The scientific value of such an inquiry lies in disclosing the special (historical) laws that regulate the origin, existence, development, and death of a given social organism and its replacement by another and higher organism

Lenin desarrolla la misma analogía biologicista que Plejanov e incluso termonológicamente está más cercano a los sociólogos (su énfasis en el organismo social). Sin embargo, esta terminología sirve para sustanciar posiciones no biologicistas (también hay que recordar que la anaología es con un darwin entendido tal como M y E lo entendieron -el historizador antiteleológica de la naturaleza-), vinculadas con el énfasis en la lucha de clases como cuestión objetiva (tanto contra el fatalismo naturalista como contra el subjetivismo voluntarista), el énfasis en las rrpp, posiciones cercanas al desarrollo desigual y combinado, y el rechazo de la distinción entre tradición y modernidad (los modos precapitalistas también tienen de leyes de movimiento específicas...)
El punto es que Lenin justamente critica las analogías con la física y la química, conociendo y citando los mismos escritos donde M y E sustancian esta forma de anaología como la correcta...Seguir reflexión

vi.vii) Dialéctica es invertir a Hegel, coqueteando con su fraseología, algunas expresiones cercanas a la teoría del reflejo y biologicistas

Marx says plainly that his method is the “direct opposite” of Hegel’s method. According to Hegel the development of the idea, in conformity with the dialectical laws of the triad,

determines the development of the real world. And it is only in that case, of course, that one can speak of the importance of the triads, of the incontrovertibility of the dialectical process. “With me, on the contrary,” says Marx, “the ideal is nothing but the reflection of the material.” And the whole matter thus amounts to an “affirmative recognition of the existing state of things and of its inevitable development”; no other role is left for the triads than that of the lid and the shell (“I coquetted with the modes of expression peculiar to Hegel,” Marx says in this same Afterword), in which only philistines could be interested

…but not about what dialectics is, whether the development of society is really a process of natural history, whether the materialist concept of social-economic formations as special social organisms is correct, whether the methods of objective analysis of these formations are right, whether social ideas really do not determine social development but are themselves determined by it, and so forth?

vii) Mikhailovsky es como Duhring: Lenin recurre a Engels

vii.i) Duhring y la transformación de propiedad privada en pp capitalista y luego en propiedad social

The Hegelian negation of the negation, in default of anything better and clearer, has in fact to serve here as the midwife to deliver the future from the womb of the past. The abolition of “individual property,” which since the sixteenth century has been effected in the way indicated above, is the first negation. It will be followed by a second, which bears the character of a negation of the negation, and hence of a restoration of “individual property,” but in a higher form, based on common ownership of land and of the instruments of labour. Herr Marx calls this new “individual property” also “social property,” and in this there appears the Hegelian higher unity, in which the contradiction is supposed to be sublated’” (aufgehoben—a specific Hegelian term), “‘that is to say, in the Hegelian verbal jugglery, both overcome and preserved....

vii.ii) Duhring y un Marx metafísico, nebuloso, que juega con las palabras

(aufgehoben—a specific Hegelian term), “‘that is to say, in the Hegelian verbal jugglery, both overcome and preserved....
“‘According to this, the expropriation of the expropriators is, as it were, the automatic result of historical reality in its materially external relations.... It would be difficult to convince a sensible man of the necessity of the common ownership of land and capital, on the basis of credence in Hegelian word-juggling such as the negation of the negation.... The nebulous hybrids of Marx’s conceptions…Herr Marx remains cheerfully in the nebulous world of his property which is at once both individual and social and leaves it to his adepts to solve for themselves this profound dialectical enigma.’

vii.iii) Duhring y la crítica al marxismo como religión

For the benefit of the reader who is not familiar with these artifices, it must be pointed out expressly that Hegel’s first negation is the catechismal idea of the fall from grace, and his

second is that of a higher unity leading to redemption. The logic of facts can hardly be based on this nonsensical analogy borrowed from the religious sphere

vii.iv) El primer Mikhailovsky, defensa hegeliana y bien intencionada (conciencia) del socialismo y Marx que no distingue entre propiedad privada y pp capitalista

(Nota al pie) "Karl Marx Being Tried by Y. Zhukovsky." Objecting to Mr. Zhukovsky's assertion that Marx is a defender of private property, Mr. Mikhailovsky refers to this scheme of Marx's and explains it in the following manner. "In his scheme Marx employed two well-known tricks of Hegelian dialectics: firstly, the scheme is constructed according to the laws of the Hegelian triad; secondly, the synthesis is based on the identity of opposites—individual and social property. This means that the word 'individual' here has the specific, purely conditional meaning of a term of the dialectical process, and absolutely nothing can be based on it." This was said by a man possessed of the most estimable intentions, defending, in the eyes of the Russian public, the "sanguine" Marx from the bourgeois Mr. Zhukovsky. And with these estimable intentions he explains Marx as basing his conception of the process on "tricks"! Mr. Mikhailovsky may draw from this what is for him the not unprofitable moral that, whatever the matter in hand, estimable intentions alone are rather inadequate

El primer Mikhailovsky y la defensa del socialismo y de Marx negando solo la necesidad de la propiedad privada (no distingue entre distintas formas de propiedad privada). Y haciéndolo con una dialéctica mal aprendida (en la cual la tesis deja de existir plenamente y es un mero artificio en la conclusión -muy distintos al desarrollo desigual combinado, las formas de explotación capitalistas no clásicas, las conclusiones que Engels saca de los descubrimientos matemáticos de Marx...)
La defensa bien intencionada de Marx y el socialismo se basa solo en cuestiones de conciencia (no es arbitrario que no sepa distinguir entre las distintas formas de propiedad privada -critique al mero individualismo-) y que por tanto su socialismo sea volitivo y no tenga bae material o histórica...
Lenin y la crítica a una de las formas de marxistización del populismo (el socialismo bine intencionado)

vii.v) Engels y la propiedad individual basada en la propiedad social en Marx (antitecnologicismo –contra Hyndman)

"this means that social ownership extends to the land and the other means of production, and individual ownership to the products, that is, the articles of consumption. And in order to make the matter comprehensible even to children of six, Marx assumes on page 56" (Russ. ed., p. 30).52 "'a community of free individuals, carrying on their work with the means of production in common, in which the labour-power of all the different individuals is consciously applied as the combined labour-power of the community,' that is, a society organised on a socialist basis; and he continues: 'The total product of our community is a social product. One portion serves as fresh means of production and remains social.' But another portion is consumed by the members as means of subsistence. 'A distribution of this portion among them is consequently necessary.

(Engels subraya la organización del proceso de trabajo consciente-comunitaria: contra la idea de Hyndman et al, los cuales suponen que el proceso de trabajo y producción ya está organizado por el mpc y que el socialismo solo supone un cambio en las relaciones de apropiación...Mas todavía, esta distinción entre Hyndman et al y Engels se ve en que la distribución de los productos bajo el socialismo se deriva de reorganización consciente del proceso de trabajo y producción...

vii. vi) Engels y el mpms según Marx (no virtuoso, no epocal, prehistoria del capital)

"he sets out the final conclusions which he draws from the preceding 50" (Russ. ed., 35) "pages of economic and historical investigation into the so-called primitive accumulation of capital. Before the capitalist era, petty industry existed, at least in England, on the basis of the private property of the labourer in his means of production…dissolution of private property based on the labour of its owner. This became possible because the petty industry referred to above is compatible only with narrow and primitive bounds of production and society and at a certain stage brings forth the material agencies for its own annihilation. This annihilation, the transformation of the individual and scattered means of production into socially concentrated ones, forms the prehistory of capital

vii.vii) Engels y el pasaje supuestamente reformista y antimonopolista de Marx hacia el final de El Capital (situación revolucionaria objetiva)

As soon as the labourers are turned into proletarians, their means of labour into capital, as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, the further socialization of labour and further transformation of the land and other means of production" (into capital), "and therefore the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form. 'That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the concentration of capital. One capitalist always kills many…the co-operative form of the labour process, the conscious technical application of science…Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. Capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Concentration of the means of production and socialization of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.'

…where the dialectical miracles for his faithful followers; where the mysterious dialectical rubbish and…Marx merely shows from history, and here states in a summarized form, that just as formerly petty industry by its very development, necessarily created the

conditions of its own annihilation ... so now the capitalist mode of production has likewise itself created the material conditions from which it must perish. The process is a historical one, and if it is at the same time a dialectical process, this is not Marx's fault, however annoying it may be to Herr Dühring

La cita antimonopolista de El Capital que nosotros consignamos como solo describiendo una situación revolucionaria objetiva. Notemos que Marx da cierto espacio en ella para la confusión que el reformismo hace entre revolución económica capitalista y la revolución política de los obreros contra la burguesía. El punto es que lo que es un mero pasaje en Marx (y que puede ser refutados por miles de citas y contexto), es trasformado por el reformismo en el centro, el pilar de sus teorizaciones…Incluso podría decirse que este pasaje supuestamente antimonopolista en realidad no lo es tanto. Primero, porque no afirma la igualdad u homogeneización de la clase obrera con los capitales expropiados , sino solo el crecimiento del nivel de explotación (el aumento del número de obreros no está predicado sobre la alianza de éstos con capitales expropiados o cercanos a ser expropiados). Segundo, el proceso objetivo explotación es el que produce la lucha de clases desde abajo (se habla de clasismo no consciencia marcusiana traída desde afuera -los obreros no so material de explotación borreguil-). No afirma que la revolución obrera sea igual a la revolución económica capitalista, sino solo que nace a partir de ella (que ésta tiene raíces materiales, que no nace de la nada…Engels en el Antiduhring sustanciando una interpretación del pasaje no tan distinta a la nuestra...(sobre todo señala la cuestión de la determinación relativa y las condiciones de posibilidad...

vii.viii) Marx deriva el modo de apropiación del mp, mientras Hyndman et al quieren mantener el modo de producción solo cambiando el modo de apropiación

"It is only at this point, after Marx has completed his proof on the basis of historical and economic facts, that he proceeds: 'The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of the negation'—and so on (as quoted above)

vii.ix) Engels vacila rescatando el pasaje de que el comunismo desarrolla una expropiación que ya ocurre en la realidad del mpc

"Thus, by characterising the process as the negation of the negation, Marx does not intend to prove that the process was historically necessary. On the contrary: only after he has proved from history that in fact the process has partially already occurred, and partially must occur in the future, he in addition characterises it as a process which develops in accordance with a definite dialectical law. That is all

viii) Lenin rescata el anti-rousseanismo de El AntiDuhring y remarca que Marx leyó y revisó el escrito de Engels antes de su publicación

* It is worth while, I think, to note in this connection that the entire explanation given by Engels is contained in the same chapter in which he discusses the seed, the teaching of Rousseau, and other examples of the dialectical process. It would seem that the absurdity of accusing Marxism of Hegelian dialectics would have been made quite evident by merely comparing these examples with the clear and categorical statements by Engels (and by Marx, to whom the manuscript was read before printing), and there can be no question of trying to prove anything by triads or of inserting in the depiction of the real process the "conditional members" of these triads

Degeneración del populismo marxistizante

i) Duhring reconoce que Marx abordó las acusaciones de hegelianismo, Mikhailovsky no

Dühring, despite the fact that he could not speak of Marx without foaming at the mouth, nevertheless considered it necessary to mention in the next section of his History that Marx in the Afterword categorically repudiated the accusation of Hegelianism. Mr. Mikhailovsky, however, has nothing to say about the (above quoted) absolutely definite and clear statements by Marx on what he conceives the dialectical method to be

ii) Del Mikhailovsky de 1877 al de 1894

Time was when Mr. Mikhailovsky not only knew himself what this reply was, but lectured others on it. Mr. Zhukovsky, he wrote in 1877, had good grounds for regarding Marx's conception of the future as conjectural, but he "had no moral right" to ignore the question of the socialization of labour, "to which Marx attributes vast importance." Well, of course! Zhukovsky in 1877 had no moral right to evade the question, but Mr. Mikhailovsky in 1894 has this moral right! Perhaps, quod licet Jovi, non licet bovi?!*

(…) In respect of such methods of "criticism" employed by Mr. Mikhailovsky, criticism which begins with the statement that he does not know where, in what work, the materialist conception of history is expounded, it would perhaps be worth while to recall that there was a time when the author knew one of these works and was able to appraise it more correctly. In 1877, Mr. Mikhailovsky expressed the following opinion of Capital: "If we remove from Capital the heavy, clumsy and unnecessary lid of Hegelian dialectics" (How strange! How is it that "Hegelian dialectics" were "unnecessary" in 1877, while in 1894 it appears that materialism rests on "the incontrovertibility of the dialectical process"?)

(…) An astonishing thing! In 1877, "the whole of Capital was devoted to a materialist inquiry into a particular form of society (what else does materialism consist in, if not in explaining forms of society by material conditions?), whereas in 1894 it appears that it is not even known where, in what work, an exposition of this materialism should be sought!

(…) In 1877, Mr. Mikhailovsky wrote that "the analysis of the relations of the given form of society to the material conditions of its existence will for ever" (my italics) "remain a monument to the author's logical powers and vast erudition," whereas in 1894 he declares

that the doctrine of materialism has never and nowhere been scientifically verified and proved.

Lenin y un énfasis en el carácter social del proceso de trabajo (cruzado por la lucha de clases para criticar la tesis de la concentración lineal)

i) Premisa antitecnologicista

…perform numerous other operations under one roof. As to the general character of this regime it is excellently expressed by the saying: 'Every man for himself, and God for all.' Where does the social form of labour come in?"
Well, you can see at once that the man has grasped what it is all about! "The social form of labour" "amounts" to "working under one roof"!!

ii) Contratendecia a la descentralización (ya consignada en 1893) –contra Hyndman et al

The socialisation of labour by capitalist production does not at all consist in people working under one roof (that is only a small part of the process), but in the concentration of capital being accompanied by the specialization of social labour, by a decrease in the number of capitalists in each given branch of industry and an increase in the number of separate branches of industry—in many separate production processes being merged into one social production process.

Lenin se distingue de Hyndman Bax y los franceses al enfatizar no solo en centralización del capital, sino que también en su difusión/liberalización. Este mecanismo, que es la base para distinguir una contratendencia estructural a la cuestión del 1%, en Lenin no cumple un rol pasajero, sobre todo porque es una de las bases que utilizó en su artículo de 1893 para sustaciar la tesis de que el mpc crea por sí mismo su propio mercado....

iii) Ejemplo de esta contratendencia a la centralización del capital

When, in the days of handicraft weaving, for example, the small producers themselves spun the yarn and made it into cloth, we had a few branches of industry (spinning and weaving were merged). But when production becomes socialised by capitalism, the number of separate branches of industry increases: cotton spinning is done separately and so is weaving; this very division and the concentration of production give rise to new branches—machine building, coal mining, and so forth.

iv) La tesis de la concentración utilizada no para legitimar el frente popular, sino para explicar la mayor unidad objetiva de la clase dominante

In each branch of industry, which has now become more specialised, the number of capitalists steadily decreases. This means that the social tie between the producers becomes increasingly stronger, the producers become welded into a single whole.

v) Semilla crítica a la teoría de la de las crisis basada en la desproporcionalidad

The isolated small producers each performed several operations simultaneously, and were therefore relatively independent of each other: when, for instance, the handicraftsman himself sowed flax, and himself spun and wove, he was almost independent of others. It was this (and only this) regime of small, dispersed commodity producers that justified the saying: "Every man for himself, and God for all," that is, an anarchy of market fluctuations. The case is entirely different under the socialization of labour that has been achieved due to capitalism.

vi) Necesidad objetiva de unificación de la clase dominante derivada de las crisis (lucha de clases y no lucha de todos contra todos)

The manufacturer who produces fabrics depends on the cotton- yarn manufacturer; the latter depends on the capitalist planter who grows the cotton, on the owner of the engineering works, the coal mine, and so on and so forth. The result is that no capitalist can get along without others. It is clear that the saying "every man for himself" is quite inapplicable to such a regime: here each works for all and all for each (and no room is left for God—either as a supermundane fantasy or as a mundane "golden calf"). The character of the regime changes completely. When, during the regime of small, isolated enterprises, work came to a standstill in any one of them, this affected only a few members of society, it did not cause any general confusion, and therefore did not attract general attention and did not provoke public interference.

Sustanciando la crítica a Hydman et al. el mpc no acusa el individualismo competitivo, sino que solidifica la unidad de la clase dominante (lucha de clases y no lucha de todos contra todos)
Negación explícita de la mano invisible de Adam Smith sobre todo basado en la necesidad objetiva de unificación que tiene la clase dominante debido al hecho de las crisis

vii) Negación explícita de la mano invisible de Adam Smith (necesidad de unificació clase dominante derivada de las crisis)

But when work comes to a standstill in a large enterprise, one engaged in a highly specialised branch of industry and therefore working almost for the whole of society and, in its turn, dependent on the whole of society (for the sake of simplicity I take a case where socialization has reached the culminating point), work is bound to come to a standstill in all the other enterprises of society, because they can only obtain the products they need from this enterprise, they can only dispose of all their own commodities if its commodities are available

viii) "Adaptación" y "apropiación" es mera terminología en Lenin (bases antitecnologicistas firmes)

Is it not clear that the form of production comes into irreconcilable contradiction with the form of appropriation? Is it not evident that the latter must adapt itself to the former and must become social, that is, socialist? But the smart philistine of Otechestvenniye Zapiski reduces the whole thing to work under one roof. Could anything be wider of the mark! (I have described only the material process, only the change in production relations, without touching on the social aspect of the process, the fact that the workers become united, welded together and organised, since that is a derivative and secondary phenomenon.)

Si bien Lenin utiliza la fórmula hyndmaniana que enaftiza en las relaciones de apropiación, todo el pasaje anterior está signado por una diferenciación con estas posiciones a la Hyndman. Y esta interpretación se nos reafirma sobre todo porque critica el tecnologicismo neutralista burdo de su oponente ("meramente todos trabajan juntos bajo un mismo techo") al enfatizar en el carácter social (de clase) del proceso de producción, y aclarando que por el momento deja de lado el carácter social (de clase) del proceso de trabajo

Crítica a los demócratas rusos como pequeñoburgueses

The reason such elementary things have to be explained to the Russian “democrats” is that they are so badly stuck in the mud of petty-bourgeois ideas that to imagine any but a petty-bourgeois order of things is quite beyond them

El primer Lenin critica de entrada a la pequeñaburguesía y no les concede siquiera el concepto "democracia"
(igual que el Marx de 1843 -sobre la madera prusiana y 1850 -lucha de clases en francia y demases-). Muy distinto al punto de partida de Guesde, Lafargue, Deville, Kautsky, etc

Sobre el mpms

i) Mikhailovsky y una crítica al mpms en la Edad Media (lee en Marx en realidad a Hyndman)

“In the Middle Ages, Marx’s individual property based on the proprietor’s own labour was neither the only nor the predominating factor, even in the realm of economic relations. There was much more besides, but the dialectical method in Marx’s interpretation” (and not in Mr. Mikhailovsky’s garbled version of it?)

ii) Lenin contra la cita mañosa

Is any serious polemic thinkable with a man who (as Engels said of Dühring) cannot quote accurately, even by way of exception?

Engels/Lenin contra la cita mañosa, de la cual el mismo Lenin fue buen representante para sustanciar su estrategia en 1905, así como también lo vimos al rescatar una carta de Marx a Ruge en 1843 (en cambio, nosotros citamos in extenso y no dejamos fuera los pasajes que no coinciden con nuestra interpretación, sino que los explicamos...)

ii) Lenin crítico del mpms (El Capital analiza el mpc, su método debe aún aplicarse a formaciones precapitalistas)

(Nota al pie)* The other features of the economic system of the Middle Ages are omitted because they belonged to the feudal social formation whereas Marx investigates only the capitalist formation. In its pure form the process of capitalist development actually began—in England, for instance—with the system of small, isolated commodity producers and their individual labour property

Marxistización del populismo (fenómeno alemán, francés e inglés) vs degeneración del populismo (Rusia)

Firstly, the Russian, peasant socialism of the seventies—which "snorted" at freedom because of its bourgeois character, fought the "clear-browed liberals" who zealously covered up the antagonistic nature of Russian life, and dreamed of a peasant revolution—has completely decayed and has begotten that vulgar, philistine liberalism which discerns an "encouraging impression" in the progressive trends of peasant farming, forgetting that they are accompanied (and determined) by the wholesale expropriation of the peasantry

Mr. Mikhailovsky, instead of seriously sitting down to reconsider the whole question, simply took the bit between his teeth. Instead of welcoming Marx (as he did in 1872 and 1877) he now barks at him under cover of dubious praise, and rages and splutters against the Russian Marxists for refusing to rest content with the defence of the economically weakest," with warehouses and improvements in the countryside, with museums and artels for handicraftsmen, and similar well-meaning philistine ideas of progress, and for wanting to remain "sanguine" people, advocates of social revolution, and to teach, guide and organise the really revolutionary elements of society

Pero en Rusia se produce un proceso específico. Mientras en Alemania, Francia e Inglaterra el populismo se marxistizaba (la burguesía degeneraba pero a la vez se internaba en el movimiento obrero teóricamente -y con ello el populismo ciudadanista no degeneraba sino que se acercaba a posiciones correctas (aunque obviamente mantenía su semilla populista por lo que solo se convertía en un mejor enemigo de clase, con mejores argumentos contra el movimiento obrero)...en Rusia el populismo degeneraba (de su revolución campesina que se salta el capitalismo, a las mejoras burguesas en el seno del capitalismo para el pequeño capital)...
Esta diferencia entre la deriva del populismo ruso y la deriva del populismo ciudadanista, expresa de manera muy gráfica el desarrollo desigual al nivel de la estrategia política y la teoría social. Notar que el populismo degradado de de Mikhailovsky no es reforimista obrero, sino que reformista burgués, y que el reformismo obrero tenía expresión en el marxismo economicista...(con ellos sí se podía hacer frente único, con el populismo de Mikhailovsky no). Ver, a la vez, que el populismo emerge nuevamente después de 1903 (y sobre todo en 1905), pero emerge bajo una nueva forma, distinta a la de Mikhailovsky. El populismo de este último era liberal burgués y gradualista, mientras el populismo de 1905 es revolucionario democrático-burgués. Hay que pensar sobre esta nueva formade

populismo que reemerge, el cual toma algunos elementos de Mikhailovsky, pero también del populismo revolucionario tipo Cernychevsky (hay que pensar por qué vuelve a remerger, que se maniene constnate, etc).
Lo básico, por otra parte, es que el populismo marxistizante no tiene una existencia enfática antes de 1903 en Rusia, y que solo existe como semilla en algunos pasajes de Plejanov (mientras que el reformismo ruso es obrero y no populismo marxistizante)...Seguir reflexión

Clara distinción en el seno del marxismo entre sus partes componentes (materialismo histórico y materialismo dialéctico)

The doctrine he set out to demolish is based, firstly, on the materialist conception of history, and, secondly, on the dialectical method (pp182)

Primera aparición histórica del término "materialismo dialéctico"

The critic also declared that Marx's polemic against the idealists was "one-sided," but he did not say a word about the relation of these idealists' views to the subjective method and the relation of Marx's dialectical materialism to these views (pp183)

Mikhailovsky y el marxismo como religión

…materialism, argues Mr. Mikhailovsky, "is really spreading very rapidly among the working class." How does Mr. Mikhailovsky explain this fact? "The success…And he goes on to say: "These prospects require of the German working class which is adopting them and of those who take a warm interest in its future neither knowledge nor the effort of critical thinking. They require only faith." In other words, the spread of materialism and scientific socialism in breadth is due to the fact that this doctrine promises the workers a better future!

i) Somos antiutópicos (respuesta de Lenin)

Everybody knows that scientific socialism never painted any prospects for the future as such

ii) No somos normativistas a la ilustrado metafísico francés (Lenin vuelve sobre la carta de Marx a Ruge de 1843)

"We do not say to the world," Marx wrote as far back as 1843, and he fulfilled this programme to the letter, "we do not say to the world: 'Cease struggling—your whole struggle is senseless.' All we do is to provide it with a true slogan of struggle. We only show the world what it is actually struggling for, and consciousness is a thing which the world must acquire, whether it likes it or not."

iii) Ponemos énfasis en la explotación

Everybody knows that as far as prospects for the future are concerned incomparably more was contributed by the earlier socialists, who described future society in every detail…until large-scale machine industry drew the mass of proletarian workers into the vortex of political life, and until the true slogan of their struggle was found…and it was certainly not found by means of prospects, but by a scientific analysis of the present bourgeois regime, by an elucidation of the necessity of exploitation under this regime, by an investigation of the laws of its development

A diferencia de Hyndman y et al Lenin siempre pone en el centro a la explotación, la cual vincula de modo orgánico con las leyes de movimiento del mpc

iv) Desarrollo gran industria a favorecido el crecimiento de los partidos obreros

It remains an indisputable fact that the workingclass movement spreads and develops precisely where and to the extent that large-scale capitalist machine industry develops; the socialist doctrine is successful precisely when it stops arguing about social conditions that conform to human nature and sets about making a materialist analysis of contemporary social relations and explaining the necessity for the present regime of exploitation

v) Propagandiza la autoafirmación obrera contra el paternalismo de los amigos del pueblo

…and meanwhile—meanwhile the workers must wait, must rely on the friends of the people and not begin, with "unjustified self-assurance," an independent struggle against the exploiters…Is it not obvious how unjustifiably self-assured are those who value science only insofar as it teaches the exploited to wage an independent struggle for their emancipation, teaches them to keep away from all "friends of the people" engaged in glossing over class antagonisms and desirous of taking the whole business upon themselves

Degeneración del populismo ruso

i) La mantención del campesinismo ahora se expresa en un burdo eclecticismo que toma instituciones del pasado y del presente

Indeed, how simple it is! "Take" what is good from everywhere—and the trick is done! From the medieval forms "take" the labourer's ownership of the means of production, and from the new (i.e., capitalist) forms "take" liberty, equality, enlightenment and culture. And there is nothing to discuss! Here the whole subjective method in sociology is as clear as daylight: sociology starts with a utopia—the labourer's ownership of the land—and indicates the conditions for realising the desirable, namely, "take" what is good from here and from there

ii) Contra el mecanicismo que conjunta externamente instituciones, derivado de una metafísica ilustrada subjetivista

…his philosopher takes a purely metaphysical view of social relations as of a simple mechanical aggregation of various institutions, a simple mechanical concatenation of various phenomena.

iii) Contra el mecanicismo y la concepción de la totalidad social como edificio (que Bax y Hyndman toman de Bradlaugh)

He plucks out one of these phenomena—the cultivator's ownership of the land in its medieval forms—and thinks that it can be transplanted to all other forms, just as a brick can be transferred from one building to another. But that is not studying social relations; it is mutilating the material to be studied.

iv) Contra el pasado dorado feudal (tipo mpms), la lucha de clases y la explotación allí también primaban

In reality, there was no such thing as the cultivator's ownership of the land existing separately and independently, as you have taken it; it was only one of the links in the then existing production relations, which consisted in the land being divided up among large landed proprietors, landlords, who allotted it to the peasants in order to exploit them, so that the land was, as it were, wages in kind: it provided the peasant with necessary products, so that he might be able to produce a surplus product for the landlord; it provided the means for the peasants to render feudal service to the landlord

…does not set out at all to explain the then existing "forms of labour" and to present them as a definite system of production relations, as a definite social formation. To use Marx's expression, the dialectical method, which requires us to regard society as a living organism in its functioning and development, is alien to him.

Por todo esto vemos que la analogía biologicista en Lenin no tiene nada que ver con la anaolgía biologicista propia de Spencer y Comte (partiendo por el hecho de que en realidad no hay analogía con el cuerpo humano, sino que inscripción del ser humano dentro del género animal...)… Notemos que este Lenin que enfatiza en el "organismo social" es precisamente uno que defiende el contenido del desarrollo desigual y combinado (antifuncionalismo por defínción)

Caracterización y programa en Lenin

i) Agrupa formas de explotación capitalistas no clásicas con las formas clásicas- contra la tesis del semifeudalismo

It is obvious that a theory based on this was bound to stand aloof from actual social evolution, for the simple reason that our utopians had to live and act not under social relations formed from elements taken from here and from there, but under those which determine the relation of the peasant to the kulak (the enterprising muzhik), of the

handicraftsman to the buyer-up, of the worker to the factory owner, and which they completely failed to understand

ii) Afirmacion enfática de la dominancia del capitalismo en Rusia desde 1861 - contra la tesis del semifeudalismo

Seeing that the whole post-Reform history of Russia consisted in the ruin of the masses and the enrichment of a minority, observing the colossal expropriation of the small producers side by side with universal technical progress, noting that these polarising tendencies arose and increased wherever, and to the extent that, commodity economy developed and became consolidated, they could not but conclude that they were confronted with a bourgeois (capitalist) organisation of social economy, necessarily giving rise to the expropriation and oppression of the masses.

iii) Afirmación enfática del desarrollo desigual y combinado (formas de explotación capitalistas no clásicas unidas esencialmente con la gran industria)

Their practical programme was directly determined by this conviction; this programme was to join in the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, the struggle of the propertyless classes against the propertied, which constitutes the principal content of economic reality in Russia, from the most out-of-the-way village to the most up-todate and perfected factory.

Pero en ello Lenin debe esconder las diferencias programáticas entre el Plejanov de 1887 y el de 1889

iv) El proletariado de la gran industria como vanguardia (porque está plenamente expropiado, pero debe acaudillar al resto de la clase obrera que es agraria tamb)

How were they to join in? The answer was again suggested by reality. Capitalism had brought the principal branches of industry to the stage of large-scale machine industry; by thus socialising production, it had created the material conditions for a new system and had at the same time created a new social force—the class of factory workers, the urban proletariat. Being subjected to the same bourgeois exploitation—for such, in its economic essence, is the exploitation to which the whole working population of Russia is subjected—this class, however, has been placed in a special, favourable position as far as its emancipation is concerned: it no longer has any ties with the old society based entirely on exploitation; the very conditions of its labour and the circumstances of life organise it, compel it to think and enable it to step into the arena of political struggle.

Una de las condiciones del fracción a la vanguardia de proletariado es este hecho de que la gran industria lo desprovee de todo vinculo propietario con sociedades pasada (no la determinan las formas de explotación capitalistas no clásicas al parecer)

v) Activación política se da obrerizando el programa no desobrerizándolo como en Kautsky

It was only natural that the Social-Democrats should direct all their attention to, and base all their hopes on, this class, that they should reduce their programme to the development of its class consciousness, and direct all their activities towards helping it rise to wage a direct political struggle against the present regime, and towards drawing the whole Russian proletariat into this struggle

Tradición rescatada por Lenin

i) El marxismo no es un sistema filosófico universal, una fórmula que todo lo explica (sino que es ciencia)

No Marxist has ever argued anywhere that there "must be" capitalism in Russia "because" there was capitalism in the West, and so on. No Marxist has ever regarded Marx's theory as some universally compulsory philosophical scheme of history, as anything more than an explanation of a particular social-economic formation. Only Mr. Mikhailovsky, the subjective philosopher, has managed to display such a lack of understanding of Marx as to attribute to him a universal philosophical theory; and in reply to this, he received from Marx the quite explicit explanation that he was knocking at the wrong door. No Marxist has ever based his Social-Democratic views on anything but the conformity of theory with reality and the history of the given, i.e., the Russian, social and economic relations

ii) Aquella que se distingue de la marxistización del populismo

Of course, Mr. Mikhailovsky may refute these statements as much as he pleases, by arguing that he has heard "with his own ears" the profession of an abstract historical scheme… It is very possible, of course, that the witty interlocutors of the witty philosopher called themselves Marxists, Social- Democrats, and so forth—but who does not know that nowadays (as was noted long ago) every scoundrel likes to array himself in "red" garments?* And if Mr. Mikhailovsky is so perspicacious that he cannot distinguish these "mummers" from Marxists, or if he has understood Marx so profoundly as not to have noticed this criterion—most emphatically advanced by Marx—of the whole doctrine (the formulation of "what is going on before our eyes")

iii) Identificación con el Plejanov más antipopulista ("Nuestras diferencias")

Plekhanov and his circle. And had he done so—and that obviously is what anybody with any decency should have done—and had he even consulted the first Social-Democratic work, Plekhanov's Our Differences, he would have found in its very first pages a categorical declaration made by the author on behalf of all the members of the circle: "We in no case wish to cover our programme with the authority of a great name" (i.e., the authority of Marx)

iv) El marxismo como ciencia y no fórmula abstracta. Lenin rescata el método investigativo de Plejanov

"I repeat," Plekhanov says, "that the most consistent Marxists may disagree in the appraisal of the present Russian situation"; our doctrine is the "first attempt at applying this particular scientific theory to the analysis of very complicated and entangled social relations."

v) Método, criterio "realista"

It would seem difficult to speak more clearly: the Marxists unreservedly borrow from Marx's theory only its invaluable methods, without which an elucidation of social relations is impossible, and, consequently, they see the criterion of their judgement of these relations not in abstract schemes and suchlike nonsense at all, but in its fidelity and conformity to reality

vi) La importancia de formular correctamente la problemática (contra el voluntarsmo de los ilustrados metafísicos)

But that is not so. The question he was dealing with was—"must Russia pass through the capitalist phase of development?" Hence, the question was not given a Marxist formulation at all, but was in conformity with the subjective methods of various native philosophers of ours, who see the criterion of this "must" in the policy of the authorities, or in the activities of "society," or in the ideal of a society that "corresponds to human nature," and similar twaddle

vii) Rescate del Plejanov de 1885 para rechazar enfáticamente la tesis semifeudal como válida para Rusia

He left aside entirely the question of the "must," as being an idle one that could be of interest only to subjectivists, and dealt exclusively with real social and economic relations and their actual evolution. And that is why he gave no direct answer to this wrongly formulated question, but instead replied: "Russia has entered the capitalist path."

(…)What is this?! Mr. Critic must surely know that the Russian Marxists are socialists whose point of departure is the view that the reality of our environment is capitalist society, and that there is only one way out of it—the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie

viii) Formas de explotación no clásicas como plenamente capitalistas

Mr. Mikhailovsky's argument quoted above that he presents the views of the Social-Democrats as being: "Russia will develop her own capitalist production." Evidently, in the opinion of this philosopher, Russia has not got "her own" capitalist production. The author apparently shares the opinion that Russian capitalism is confined to one and a half million workers. We shall later on again meet with this childish idea of our "friends of the people," who class all the other forms of exploitation of free labour under heaven knows what heading.

ix) Contra la reducción típico-ideal del proletariado que termina negando su existencia (a lo dependentista)

Or, to put it plainly, there is no exploitation of the mass of the people by a handful of capitalists, there is no ruin of the vast majority of the population and no enrichment of a few? The muzhik has still to be separated from the land? But what is the entire post-Reform history of Russia, if not the wholesale expropriation of the peasantry, proceeding with unparalleled intensity? One must possess great courage indeed to say such things publicly. And Mr. Mikhailovsky possesses that courage: "Marx dealt with a ready-made proletariat and a ready-made capitalism, whereas we have still to create them." Russia has still to create a proletariat?! In Russia—the only country where such a hopeless poverty of the masses and such shameless exploitation of the working people can be found; which has been compared (and legitimately so) to England as regards the condition of the poor; and where the starvation of millions of people is a permanent thing existing side by side, for instance, with a steady increase in the export of grain—in Russia there is no proletariat!!

x) División del pueblo en clases. Centro en la explotación. El Estado no es asiático ni semifeudal, sino que capitalista, un órgano burgués más

…but because these masses are being shamelessly robbed by a handful of exploiters, that if they bury their heads in the sand like ostriches so as not to see these exploiters, the exploiters will disappear. And when the Social-Democrats tell them that it is shameful cowardice to fear to look reality in the face, when they take the fact of exploitation as their starting-point and say that its only possible explanation lies in the bourgeois organisation of Russian society, which is splitting the mass of the people into a proletariat and a bourgeoisie, and in the class character of the Russian state, which is nothing but the organ of the rule of this bourgeoisie, and that therefore the only way out lies in the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie

xi) Problemática rusa correcta: proletariado que existe es propio del régimen capitalista o no lo es?

(Nota al pie) But perhaps here too, Mr. Mikhailovsky may try to wriggle out by declaring that he had no intention of saying that there was no proletariat at all in Russia, but only that there was no capitalist proletariat? Is that so? Then why did you not say so? The whole question is one of whether the Russian proletariat is a proletariat characteristic of the bourgeois or of some other organisation of social economy. Who is to blame if in the course of two whole articles you did not utter a word about this, the only serious and important question, but preferred instead to talk all sorts of nonsense, and reach the craziest conclusions?

xii) Contra la tesis semifeudal y la política de los emprendimientos populares

…he includes even Mr. Skvortsov (author of The Economic Causes of Starvation) among the "Marxists…. he is nothing but a most vulgar bourgeois. What sort of Marxist is he if he

does not understand that the social environment for which he projects his progressive schemes is a bourgeois environment, and that therefore all "agricultural improvements" actually to be observed even in peasant farming are bourgeois progress, which improves the position of a minority but proletarianises the masses! What sort of Marxist is he if he does not understand that the state to which he addresses his projects is a class state, capable only of supporting the bourgeoisie and oppressing the proletariat!

Parte III

Contra la tesis de la "economía popular" y la "industria popular"

We have seen how Mr. Yuzhakov disposes of matters with meaningless phrases about people's land renting that supports people's economy, etc., using them to cover up the fact that he does not understand the economic life of our peasants…Now Mr. Krivenko repeats exactly the same sort of phrases about handicraft industries. He flatly contrasts "our people's industry," i.e., handicraft industries, to capitalist industry (No. 12, pp. 180-81). "People's production" (sic!), says he, "in the majority of cases arises naturally," whereas capitalist industry "is very often created artificially." In another passage he contrasts "small-scale people's industry" to "large-scale, capitalist industry."

i) ¿Meramente producción en pequeña escala en la cual el productor posee sus medios de producción?

If you were to ask what is the distinguishing feature of the former, you would only learn that it is "small"* and that the instruments of labour are united with the producer (I borrow this latter definition from Mr. Mikhailovsky's above-mentioned article). But this is certainly far from defining its economic organisation—and, moreover, is absolutely untrue.

ii) Industria doméstica industrial (formas de explotación no clásicas) con predominancia masiva)

Mr. Krivenko says, for example, that "small-scale people's industry to this day yields a much larger total output and employs more hands than large-scale capitalist industry." The author is evidently referring to data on the number of handicraftsmen, which is as many as 4 million, or, according to another estimate, 7 million. But who does not know that the form of economy predominating in our handicraft industries is the domestic system of large-scale production? **that the bulk of the handicraftsmen occupy a position in production that is not independent at all, but, completely dependent, subordinate, that they do not process their own material but that of the merchant, who merely pays the handicraftsman a wage?**

Let me quote, for example, the excellent work by the well-known statistician, S. Kharizomenov, published in Yuridichesky Vestnik (1883, Nos. 11 and 12)…. S. Kharizomenov reached the conclusion that there is an absolute predominance of the domestic system of large-scale production, i.e., an unquestionably capitalist form of industry. "Defining the economic role of small-scale independent industry," he says, "we

arrive at the following conclusions: in Moscow Gubernia 86.5% of the annual turnover of handicraft industry is accounted for by the domestic system of large-scale production, and only 13.5% by small-scale independent industry. In the Alexandrov and Pokrov uyezds of Vladimir Gubernia, 96% of the annual turnover of handicraft industry falls to the share of the domestic system of large-scale production and manufacture, and only 4% is accounted for by small-scale independent industry."

(…) In Nizhni-Novgorod Gubernia there are in all 2,552 handicraftsmen producing this sort of cutlery, of whom 48% (1,236) work for the market, 42% (1,058) work for a master, and 10% (258) are wage-workers. Consequently, here too the independent (?) handicraftsmen are in the minority. **And those who work for the market are, of course, only apparently independent; actually they are no less enslaved to the capital of buyers-up**. If we take the data for the industries of the entire Gorbatov Uyezd, Nizhni- Novgorod Gubernia, where 21,983 working people, or 84.5%, of all who work…Thus, here too we see the predominance of the domestic system of large-scale production, the predominance of relations under which labour is enslaved to capital

iii) Contra la la utilización del término "artesanado" para pasar por encima de las diferencias de clase

…"friends of the people," as of all Russian liberals, to gloss over class antagonism and the exploitation of the working people in Russia by representing all this as just plain "defects."… Mr. Krivenko when he calls the "Pavlovo cutlery trade"— "a trade of a semi-artisan character." Mr. Krivenko when he calls the "Pavlovo cutlery trade"— "a trade of a semi-artisan character."… How can one speak here of artisan character, when the Pavlovo cutlers produce for the market and not to order? Or perhaps Mr. Krivenko regards as artisan industry the system under which a merchant orders articles from the handicraftsman and then sends them to Nizhni-Novgorod Fair? Funnily enough, this seems to be the case…Pavlovo industries…"The production of table and industrial cutlery,"* says N. F. Annensky, "is already largely approaching the factory, or, more correctly, the manufactory form." Of the 396 handicraftsmen engaged in the making of table cutlery in Nizhni-Novgorod Gubernia, only 62 (16%) work for the market, 273 (69%) work for a master,* and 61 (15%) are wage-workers. Hence, only one-sixth of them are not directly enslaved to an employer. (* I.e., for the merchant who supplies the handicraftsmen with materials and pays them ordinary wages for their labour.)

iv) Cooperación simple y manufactura no fases destinadas a desaparecer, sino que formas capitalistas reporducidas por la gran industria

Another reason why the "friends of the people" so freely ignore facts of this kind is that their conception of capitalism has not advanced beyond the commonplace vulgar idea that a capitalist is a wealthy and educated employer who runs a large machine enterprise—and they refuse to consider the scientific content of the term. In the preceding chapter we saw that Mr. Yuzhakov dates the beginning of capitalism directly from machine industry, omitting simple co-operation and manufacture. This is a widespread

error, which, incidentally, results in the capitalist organisation of our handicraft industries being ignored

v) La industria doméstica como parte plena el mpc (contra las "remanencias precapitalistas" a la Webb-Bernstein)

It goes without saying that the domestic system of largescale production is a capitalist form of industry: here we have all its features—commodity economy already at a high level of development, the concentration of the means of production in the hands of individuals, and the expropriation of the mass of the workers, who have no means of production of their own and therefore apply their labour to those of others, working not for themselves but for the capitalist.

vi) El semiproletariado como parte del mpc pleno,como parte estructural del mpc

Obviously, in its organisation, handicraft industry is pure capitalism; it differs from large-scale machine industry in being technically backward (chiefly because of the preposterously low wages) and in the fact that the workers retain diminutive farms.

(…) forgetting the generally-known fact that ownership of land does not in the least do away with the dire poverty of these landowners, who are most shamelessly robbed by other such "peasant" landowners.
They do not know, it seems, that capitalism—while still at a comparatively low level of development—was nowhere able to completely separate the worker from the land.

vii) Reducción del mpc y de la clase obrera solo a la gran industria coincide con la falta de método dialéctico

This latter circumstance particularly confuses the "friends of the people," who, as befits true metaphysicians, are accustomed to think in naked and direct contrasts: "Yea, yea—nay, nay, and whatsoever is more than these comes from the evil one." If the workers have no land—there is capitalism; if they have land—there is no capitalism.

For Western Europe, Marx established the law that only large-scale machine industry expropriates the worker once and for all. It is therefore obvious that the stock argument of there being no capitalism in our country since "the people own land" is quite meaningless, because the capitalism of simple co-operation and manufacture has never been connected anywhere with the worker's complete separation from the land, and yet, needless to say, it has not on that account ceased to be capitalism.

viii) No tan lejos de considerar que las formas de explotación capitalistas no clásicas desaparecerán una vez el capitalismo se desarrolle más...

As to large-scale machine industry in Russia—and this form is rapidly being assumed by the biggest and most important branches of our industry—here too, despite all the specific features of our life, it possesses the same property as everywhere in the capitalist West,

namely, it absolutely will not tolerate the retention of the worker's tie with the land. This fact has been proved, incidentally, by Dementyev with precise statistical material, from which he has drawn (quite independently of Marx) the conclusion that machine production is inseparably connected with the worker's complete separation from the land…and the power; of the man of property (the money owner, the buyer-up, the rich peasant, the manufactory owner, etc.) so firmly established, that one more technical advance will be enough for the "peasant" (?? who has long been living by the sale of his labour-power) to turn into a worker pure and simple.

ix) Contra el embellicimiento de la industria doméstica (es la más explotadora)

(Nota al pie) * The domestic system of large-scale production is not only a capitalist system, but the worst kind of capitalist system, one under which the most intense exploitation of the working people is combined with the minimum opportunity for the workers to wage a struggle for their emancipation

x) Desarrollo industria doméstica (ladrillos por construcción ferrocarril)

…brick industry (the making of bricks from white clay)… The industry is chiefly concentrated in three volosts of Bogorodskoye Uyezd…The industry is an old one, but has developed particularly during the past fifteen years owing to the building of a railway, which has greatly facilitated marketing. Before the railway was built the family form of production predominated, but it is now giving way to the exploitation of wage-labour. This industry, too, is not exempt from the dependence of the small industrialists on the bigger ones for marketing: owing to "lack of funds" the former sell the latter their bricks (sometimes "crude"— unbaked) on the spot at terribly low prices

xi) Distinguir distintos niveles de asalarización a pequeña escala

Taking the number of workers as a basis, we divide the establishments of the handicraftsmen into three groups: I) establishments employing 1 to 5 workers (both family and hired); 11) employing 6 to 10 workers, and III) employing over 10 workers. Examining the size of establishments, the complement of workers and the value of the output in each group, we obtain the following data

(…) pottery industry, "a purely domestic industry,"… representative of the small-scale peasant industries: its technique is the simplest, its equipment quite small and the articles it produces of universal and essential use…undoubtedly quite typical of the numerous Russian small, "people's" industries. We divide the handicraftsmen into groups: I) those employing 1 to 3 workers (family and hired); II) those employing 4 to 5 workers, and III) those employing over 5 workers

xii) Contra el Danielson que opone un handicraft indiferenciado (popular) contra el capitalismo (gran industria)

As far as the handicraft industries are concerned, they attribute the cause of exploitation to things lying outside production relations; as far as large-scale, factory capitalism is concerned, they could not help seeing that there the cause of exploitation lies precisely in the production relations…failing to understand the connection between handicraft and capitalist industry they contrasted the former to the latter, as "people's" to "artificial" industry. The idea appears that capitalism contradicts our "people's system"—an idea that is very widespread and was quite recently presented to the Russian public in a revised and improved edition by Mr. Nikolai—on…We have only to turn to an analysis of these production relations to find that the "people's system" consists of these very same capitalist production relations, although in an undeveloped, embryonic state; that—if we reject the naïve prejudice that all handicraftsmen are equal, and accurately set forth the differences among them—the difference between the "capitalist" of the factory and works and the "handicraftsman" will at times prove to be less than the difference between one "handicraftsman" and another; and that capitalism does not contradict the "people's system" but is the direct, next and immediate continuation and development of it

(…) And now look at this—why do the "friends of the people" call this industry "people's," and why do they contrast it to capitalist industry? It is only because these gentlemen are petty-bourgeois ideologists and cannot even conceive that these small producers live and operate under a system of commodity economy (that is why I call them petty bourgeois) and that their relations to the market necessarily and inevitably split them into a bourgeoisie and a proletariat…then we will see whether you can find in Russia any branch of handicraft industry, at all developed, which is not organised on capitalist lines

xiii) Relacionismo contra cosismo, relacionismo contra tecnologicismo y reducción del mpc a mera gran industria

…we may be told that the percentage of wage-workers in the given case is altogether too high?* But, as a matter of fact, the important thing here is not the absolute figures but the relations they disclose, relations which are bourgeois in essence, and which do not cease to be such whether their bourgeois character is strongly or weakly marked

(…) The "friends of the people," however, will never be able to grasp the fact that despite its general wretchedness, its comparatively tiny establishments and extremely low productivity of labour, its primitive technique and small number of wage-workers, peasant industry is capitalism. **They simply cannot grasp the point that capital is a certain relation between people, a relation which remains the same whether the categories under comparison are at a higher or a lower level of development**. Bourgeois economists have never been able to understand this; they have always objected to such a definition of capital

(…)So that when Mr. Krivenko talks about people's, real, proper, etc., industry, he is simply trying to conceal the fact that our handicraft industries are nothing but capitalism at various stages of development

xiv) Bajo desarrollo de la acumulación en producción en pequeña escala aumenta la explotación (y reproducción de formas de explotación no clásicas)

…capitalist character of the given production relations. These relations are: the product of social labour, organised by commodity economy, passes into the hands of individuals and in their hands serves as an instrument for oppressing and enslaving the working people, as a means of personal enrichment by the exploitation of the masses. And do not think that this exploitation, this oppression, is any less marked because relations of this kind are still poorly developed, because the accumulation of capital, concomitant with the ruination of the producers, is negligible. Quite the contrary. This only leads to cruder, serf forms of exploitation, to a situation where capital, not yet able to subjugate the worker directly, by the mere purchase of his labour-power at its value, enmeshes him in a veritable net of usurious extortion, binds him to itself by kulak methods, and as a result robs him not only of the surplus-value, but of an enormous part of his wages, too, and, what is more, grinds him down by preventing him from changing his "master," and humiliates him by compelling him to regard as a boon the fact that capital "gives" (sic!) him work.

xvi) Lenin y la recurrente utilización de la expresión "pueblo trabajador"

It is equally obvious that all the favourite measures of the Russian radicals either will not in the least affect the exploitation of the working people and their enslavement to capital, and will remain isolated experiments (artels), or will worsen the conditions of the working people (inalienability of allotments), or, lastly, will only refine, develop and consolidate the given capitalist relations (improvement of technique, loans, etc.)

xvii) Nueva referencia al Plejanov de 1885

Yet the differentiation of our small producers is such a general, such a major fact (to which the Social-Democrats have long been drawing the attention of Russian socialists. See the works of Plekhanov.)

xviii) Contra el fetiche de los promedios y la forma de propiedad colectiva para soslayar las diferencias de clase en el seno de la "comunidad", "pueblo"o "campesino"

It is quite clear that what we have here is a process of the complete differentiation of the small producers, the upper groups of whom are being turned into a bourgeoisie, the lower into a proletariat. Naturally, if we take general averages we shall see nothing of this and get no idea of the economics of the countryside…Everybody knows that the "equal" distribution of land within the village community does not in any way prevent its horseless members from giving up the land, letting it, going away to work and turning into proletarians; or the members with many horses from renting large tracts of land and running big and profitable farms. If, for example, we take our 24 budgets, we shall see that one rich peasant, with 6 dessiatines of allotment land, has a total income of 758.5 rubles; a middle peasant, with 7.1 dessiatines of allotment land, 391.5 rubles; and a poor

peasant, with 6.9 dessiatines of allotment land, 109.5 rubles. In general, we have seen that the ratio of the incomes of the various groups is 4 : 2 : 1

…the fact also stands out that this commodity economy, and it alone, is splitting the "people" and the "peasantry" into a proletariat (they become ruined, enter the ranks of the farm labourers) and a bourgeoisie (blood-suckers), i.e., it is turning into capitalist economy

Caracterización y programa

i) Capitalismo es progresivo porque genera fracciones obreras más combativas y clasistas al desarrollarse

(Nota al pie) If only urban factory workers are as yet capable of assimilating the idea of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, while the rural "simple-hearted and simple-minded" farm labourers i.e., the people who have actually lost those charming qualities so closely bound up with the "age-old basis" and the "community spirit," are not—it only proves the correctness of the Social-Democrats' theory of the progressive and revolutionary role of Russian capitalism.

(…) why the Social-Democrats regard the work of our capitalism as progressive when it draws these small, scattered markets together into one nation-wide market, when, in place of the legion of small well-meaning bloodsuckers, it creates a handful of big "pillars of the fatherland," when it socialises labour and raises its productivity, when it shatters the subordination of the working people to the local blood-suckers and subordinates them to large-scale capital. This subordination is progressive compared with the former— despite all the horrors of the oppression of labour, of gradual extinction, brutalisation, and the crippling of the bodies of women and children, etc.—because it AWAKENS THE MIND OF THE WORKER, converts dumb and incoherent discontent into conscious protest, converts scattered, petty, senseless revolt into an organised class struggle for the emancipation of all working folk, a struggle which derives its strength from the very conditions of existence of this large-scale capitalism, and therefore can undoubtedly count upon CERTAIN SUCCESS

(…) And they continue to this day to howl and wail about the good old times, although now, it seems, one must be blind not to see the revolutionary side of this new mode of life, not to see how capitalism is creating a new social force, which has no ties with the old regime of exploitation and is in a position to fight it.

ii) La lucha de clases permea toda Rusia y es propia no solo de la gran industria, sino también de las formas de explotación no clásicas

It was necessary to show what facts serve as the basis for the thesis (quoted above in Part 1)* that the struggle between the propertied and the propertyless is going on everywhere in Russia, not only in the mills and factories, but even in the most remote villages, and that everywhere this struggle is one between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat that emerge as a result of commodity economy.

iii) Socialismo obrero que destingue a la fracción pequeñoburguesa de la clase dominante como tal fracción (contra el pequeño explotador)

The breakup, the depeasantisation of our peasants and handicraftsmen, which can be depicted accurately thanks to the admirable material provided by Zemstvo statistics, furnishes factual proof of the correctness of precisely the Social- Democratic conception of Russian reality, the conception that the peasant and the handicraftsman are petty producers in the "categorical" meaning of the term, that is, are petty bourgeois. This thesis may be called the central point of the theory of WORKING-CLASS SOCIALISM as against the old peasant socialism, which understood neither the conditions of commodity economy in which the petty producers live, nor their capitalist differentiation due to these conditions

(…) to show them the real countryside and its real economics Anybody who studies these economics dispassionately and scientifically will be bound to admit that rural Russia constitutes a system of small, scattered markets (or small branches of a central market), which regulate the social and economic life of separate small districts. And in each of these districts we find all the phenomena that are, in general, peculiar to the social-economic organisation whose regulator is the market: we find the division of the once equal, patriarchal direct producers into rich and poor; we find the rise of capital, especially of merchant capital, which spins its web around the working people and sucks the lifeblood out of them…you are astonished that there is no place in the criticised system of views for that mass of small hucksters who swarm in each of these markets, all these higglers and chafferers or whatever else the peasants call them in different localities, for all that mass of petty exploiters who dominate the markets and ruthlessly oppress the working people.

This mass of small rural exploiters represents a terrible force, especially terrible because they oppress the isolated, single toiler, because they fetter him to themselves and deprive him of all hope of deliverance; terrible because this exploitation, in view of the barbarism of the countryside due to the low labour productivity characteristic of the system described and to the absence of communications, constitutes not only robbery of labour, but also the Asiatic abuse of human dignity

iv) Explicar las bases sociales de las concepciones "falsas" (no meros errores, no hay teoría del reflejo)

…views of the "friends of the people," to confine myself to contrasting their ideas with the Marxist ideas. One must in addition explain the "Narodnik" ideas, demonstrate their material basis in our present social-economic relations…They demonstrate the bourgeois character of our rural economy and thus confirm the correctness of classifying the "friends of the people" as ideologists of the petty bourgeoisie. But this is not all; they show that there is the closest connection between the ideas and programmes of our radicals and the interests of the petty bourgeoisie. It is this connection, which will become even clearer

after a detailed examination of their programme, that explains why these radical ideas are so widespread in our "society"

(…)But I must say that although it is nonsense, it is a type of nonsense that is useful and necessary to study, because it reflects the social and economic relations actually existing in Russia and, as a consequence, is one of the social ideas, very widespread in our country, *that Social-Democrats will have to reckon with for a long time to come*.

Populismo como expresión pequeñoburguesa de una economía campesina ya burguesa (como expresión de una fracción del enemigo de clase)
Lenin y la explicación social del absuro, del error. Un materialismo totalmente contrario a la posición metafísica que Plejanov describe tuvieron los ilustrados franceses...

v) Programa populista favorece al pequeño explotador de una manera similar que el programa agrario del SPD de 1894-5 criticado por Engels y desarrolla el mpc

…political programme of the "friends of the people,"… Examine this programme and you will find that these gentlemen wholly and completely adopt the position of modern society (i.e., that of the capitalist system, without realising it), and want to settle matters by ending and patching it up, failing to understand that all their progressive measures—cheap credit, improved machinery, banks, and so on—can only serve to strengthen and develop the bourgeoisie…The result of all these measures is naturally a foregone conclusion: one has but to recall the examples of differentiation given above to be convinced that all these credits,* improvements, banks and similar "progressive" measures will be available only to the one who, possessing a properly-run and established farm, has certain "savings," i.e., the representative of an insignificant minority, the petty bourgeoisie

vi) Organizadores del proceso de trabajo como fracción burguesa (antitecnologicismo)

Mr. Krivenko:
"The intelligentsia direct the manufacturers' enterprises, and they could direct popular industry."… Can it be denied that year after year the Russian universities and other educational establishments turn out a brand of "intelligentsia" (??) whose only concern is to find someone to feed them? Can it be denied that today, in Russia, the means for maintaining this "intelligentsia" are owned only by the bourgeois minority? Can the bourgeois intelligentsia in Russia be expected to disappear because the "friends of the people" say that they "might" serve somebody other than the bourgeoisie? Yes, they "might," if they were not a bourgeois intelligentsia. They "might" not be a bourgeois intelligentsia, "if" there were no bourgeoisie and no capitalism in Russia!

(…) **men and women doctors were followed by feldshers, then came lawyers, followed by teachers, librarians and booksellers, agronomists, forestry experts and agricultural experts generally, technicians of the most varied branches** (a very

extensive sphere, almost untouched as yet), organizers and managers of credit institutions, warehouses, etc."

Let us stop to consider, say, those "intellectuals" (??) whose activities directly pertain to the economic sphere, all those forestry experts, agricultural experts, technicians, etc. And how these people are needed in the countryside! But in WHAT countryside? It goes without saying in the countryside of the landowners, the countryside of the enterprising muzhiks, who have "savings" and can afford to pay for the services of all these "technicians" whom Mr. Krivenko is pleased to call "intellectuals." This countryside has, indeed, long been thirsting for technicians, for credits, for warehouses; all our economic literature testifies to this. But there is another countryside, much larger, and it would not harm the "friends of the people" to think of it a little more often; it is the countryside of the ruined, ragged and fleeced peasants, who not only have no "savings" with which to pay for the labour of "intellectuals,

(Muy distinto e incluso opuesto al proletariado intelectual de Kautsky, Hyndman, Guesde, Deville)

vii) Formas de propiedad comunitarias y desarrollo crediticio refuerzan la división de clases y reproducen al semiproletariado y su "patrón"

All that is required is that the rural rich should buy shares* through the communities and receive dividends from the enterprise, in which a "part of the population" will be employed and their tie with the land guaranteed— a "tie" insufficient to assure a livelihood from the land (otherwise who would go to work for "ordinary wages"?), but sufficient to bind a man to his locality, enslave him to the local capitalist enterprise and deprive him of the possibility of changing masters. I say master, capitalist, quite legitimately, for he who pays the labourer wages cannot be called anything else

(Nota al pie) I say the rich will buy the shares, despite the author's stipulation that the shares shall be owned by the communities, because after all, he speaks of the purchase of shares with money, which only the rich have. Hence, whether the business is conducted through the agency of the communities or not, only the rich will be able to pay, just as the purchase or renting of land by the community in no way prevents the rich from monopolising this land

viii) Feudalismo y transición hacia el mpc ya ocurrida (pero se retienen formas de explotación no clásicas) (desarrollo des y comb)

The point is that the transition from the feudal to the capitalist mode of production in Russia gave rise, and to some extent still gives rise, to a situation for the working people in which the peasant, being unable to obtain a livelihood from the land and to pay dues from it to the landlord (and he pays them to this very day), was compelled to resort to "outside employments," which at first, in the good old days, took the form either of independent occupations (for example, carting), or labour which was not independent but, owing to the poor development of these types of employment, was comparatively well paid.

ix) Sin fetichizar el pasado feudal como "dorado", ni querer volver a él como la utopía reaccionaria populista

Under this condition the peasantry were assured of a certain well-being as compared with things today—the well-being of serfs, who peacefully vegetated under the tutelage of a hundred thousand noble police chiefs and of the nascent gatherers of Russia's land—the bourgeoisie. And the "friends of the people" idealise this system, simply disregarding its dark sides, dream about it—"dream," because it has long ceased to exist, has long been destroyed by capitalism, which has given rise to the wholesale expropriation of the peasant farmers and turned the former "employments" into the unbridled exploitation of abundantly offered "hands."

Our petty-bourgeois knights want to preserve the peasant's "tie" with the land; but they do not want the serfdom that alone ensured this tie, and which was broken only by the commodity production and capitalism, which made this tie impossible…True to the subjective method in sociology, they want to "take" what is good from here and from there; but actually, of course, this childish desire only leads to reactionary dreaming which ignores realities…To prove the correctness of this explanation, which classes the "friends of the people" among the reactionaries

Sobre la explotación

i) Objetiva-estructural, no mero abuso (distinto del Kautsky de 1892)

Obviously not, because Madame K. lives on the labour of her peasants. Hence, exploitation has not been abolished at all. Madame K. may be forgiven for failing to see the exploitation behind her kindness to the exploited…kindness of a capitalist to a worker, rapturously relate cases where a factory owner shows concern for his workers, provides them with general stores, dwellings, etc. To conclude from the existence (and therefore "possibility") of such "facts" that there is no antagonism of interests, is not to see the wood for the trees

ii) Diatriba irónica contra el esfuerzo de una explotadora

Does Mr. Orlov really believe that in that case—that is, if the peasant farming were really prosperous—these peasants would agree to "perform all the jobs on Madame K.'s estate thoroughly, punctually and swiftly," as they do now? Or perhaps gratitude to the kind lady who sweats the life-blood out of these prosperous peasants with such maternal care will be a no less potent incentive than the hopelessness of the present condition of the peasants, who, after all, cannot dispense with pastures and cattle runs?

iii) Formas de explotación no clásicas y doble explotación reforzada por implementación del programa de populistas utópicos reaccionarios

"Quotas for People's Landownership in Russia" (Russkaya Mysl, 1885, No. 9)… Mr. Krivenko…As the minimum for "people's" landownership he took such allotments as would cover "cereal food and payments,"* while the rest, he said, could be obtained by "employments."... In other words, he simply resigned himself to a state of affairs in which the peasant, by maintaining connection with the land, is subjected to a double exploitation—partly by the landlord, on the "allotment," and partly by the capitalist, in "employments." This state of the small producers, who are subjected to a double exploitation, and whose conditions of life, moreover, are such as inevitably breed a cowed and crushed spirit, killing all hope that the oppressed class will fight, let alone be victorious—this semi-medieval condition is the nec plus ultra of the outlook and ideals of the "friends of the people."

iv) Referencia a un semifeudalismo que ya es cosa del pasado, anterior a 1861, ni siquiera comenzado en ese momento...

Well then, when capitalism, which developed with tremendous rapidity throughout the whole of Russia's post-Reform history, began to uproot this pillar of old Russia—the patriarchal, semi-serf peasantry— to drag them out of these medieval and semi-feudal conditions and to place them in a modern, purely capitalist environment,

v) Explotación como distinta del robo y con una existencia objetiva y estructural

…compelling them to abandon their old homes and wander over the face of Russia in search of work, breaking the chains of enslavement to the local "workgiver" and disclosing the basis of exploitation in general, of class exploitation as distinct from the depredations of a particular viper—when capitalism began to draw the rest of the peasant population

Concesiones al populismo de Hyndman/Kautsky (apropiación, sociedad) son terminológicas: contra la alianza con una pequeña fracción de la clase dominante

To organise large-scale production without employers, it is necessary, first of all, to abolish the commodity organisation of social economy and to replace it by communal, communist organisation, under which production is not regulated by the market, as it is at present, but by the producers themselves, by the society of workers itself, and the means of production are owned not by private individuals, but by the whole of society. Such a change from the private to the communal form of appropriation apparently requires that the form of production first be changed, that the separate, small, isolated processes of production of petty producers be merged into a single social productive process; in a word, it requires the very material conditions which capitalism creates…Moreover, to abolish employers' profit it would be necessary to expropriate the employers, who obtain their "profits" precisely because they have monopolised the means of production. And to expropriate these pillars of our fatherland, a popular revolutionary movement against the bourgeois regime is required, a movement of which only the working-class proletariat, which has no ties with this regime, is capable…

…why, such a thing as “the possibility of dispensing with employers’ profit” can be “counterbalanced”—“by something else,” namely credits, organised marketing, technical improvements…there appear such mild, liberal measures as will only supply capitalism with better weapons for the struggle, and will only strengthen, consolidate and develop our petty, “people’s” bourgeoisie. And so as to leave no doubt that the “friends of the people” champion the interests of this petty bourgeoisie alone, Mr. Krivenko adds the following remarkable explanation. It appears that the abolition of employers’ profit may be “counterbalanced” ... “by a reduction in wages”!!! **At first glance this seems to be sheer gibberish. But, no. It is the consistent application of petty-bourgeois ideas. The author observes a fact like the struggle between big capital and small and, as a true “friend of the people,” he, of course, takes the side of small ... capital. He has further heard that one of the most powerful weapons of the small capitalist is wage reduction—a fact that has been quite correctly observed and confirmed in a large number of industries in Russia, too, parallel to lengthening the working day. And so, desiring at all costs to save the small ... capitalists, he proposes “some reduction in wages, provided it is compensated by other benefits”!**

La expresión "movimiento popular revolucionario" no cumple un rol estructural, precisamente porque a la misma se le sobreimpone la hegemonía de la clase obrera... Lenin y la pequeña burguesía como parte de la clase dominante que explota trabajo ajeno. Lenin en una posición muy distinta a la del Kautskty de Erfurt, que justamente llama a la alianza con esta fracción del capital (el mismo ejemplo de reducción salarial es consignado por Kautky en Erfurt)

Lenin sobre la cultura y asistematicidad (Francia 1780s y Rusia 1890s semi-medievales)

He arrives at this conclusion from a comparison with the West, where consumption is greater. Why? Because culture is on a higher level. But what is the material basis of this culture if not the development of capitalist technique, the growth of commodity economy and exchange, which bring people into more frequent intercourse with each other and break down the medieval isolation of the separate localities? Was not culture in France, for example, on a level no higher than ours before the Great Revolution, when the semi-medieval peasantry had still not finally split into a rural bourgeoisie and a proletariat?

Lenin y la esencia burguesa de los mercados populares

And instead of speaking about the bourgeoisie being hampered by monopoly, he speaks about the “country,” instead of speaking about commodity, bourgeois circulation, he speaks about “people’s” circulation.* A bourgeois is never able to detect the difference between these two terms, great as it is.

Sobre los monopolios y lo semifeudal

i) Populismo ruso igual que Deville centra la crítica en la “plutocracia”

Otechestvenniye Zapiski. In No. 2 of that magazine, 1872, in the article “The Plutocracy and Its Basis,” we read the following

ii) Lenin y una lucha contra los monopolios semifeudales que mantiene un contenido clasista y no hace concesiones al populismmo

Opposition to monopolies and similar institutions can, and should, of course, be expressed, for they undoubtedly worsen the condition of the working people; but it must not be forgotten that besides all these medieval fetters the working people are shackled by still stronger ones, by modern, bourgeois fetters. Undoubtedly, the abolition of monopolies would be beneficial to the whole “people,” because, bourgeois economy having become the basis of the economic life of the country, these survivals of the medieval system only add to the capitalist miseries still more bitter medieval miseries. Undoubtedly, they must definitely be abolished—and the quicker and more radically, the better—in order, by ridding bourgeois society of its inherited semi-feudal fetters, to untie the hands of the working class, to facilitate its struggle against the bourgeoisie.

Compleja caracterización de los monopolios. El hecho de que Lenin oponga monopolio mercantilización burguesa, es la semilla de una concepción que considera al monopolio como una forma no burguesa (de ahí que en 1916 su predominancia se considere una forma decadente de capitalismo). A su vez, la consideración del monopolio como forma semifeudal abreva en una caracterización de la formación social rusa mediante el desarrollo desigual y combinado permeada por formas de explotación capitalistas no clásicas (recordemos que antes Lenin caracterizó enfáticamente en repetidas ocasiones a Rusia como una sociedad burguesa, por lo que las formas monopólicas semifeudales son solo eso, forma, y no estructuras que determinan las leyes de movimiento de la totalidad social). Tercero, la lucha contra los monopolios no es antimonopolista, porque se opone enfáticamente a que el elemento de lucha sean las fuerzas populares (critica sistemática a la pequeña burguesía como una explotadora capitalista más). Asimismo, la abolición de los monopolios no se busca para generar armonía ni una lucha popular, sino que para desarrollar la lucha contra la burguesía en conjunto (de ahí que incluso lo democrático-burgués en Lenin no está predicado en forma etapista, sino que busca acusar la lucha de clases, lo democrático burgués busca ser transformado en democrático-clasista)

iii) Lo democrático-burgués no etapista, sino que busca acusar la lucha de clases, busca ser transformado en democrático-clasista, no para unir al pueblo

That is how one should talk, calling a spade a spade— saying that the abolition of monopolies and of all sorts of other medieval restrictions (and in Russia their name is legion) is absolutely essential for the working class in order to facilitate its struggle against the bourgeois system. That is all. **None but a bourgeois could see only the solidarity of the interests of the whole “people” against medieval, feudal institutions and forget the profound and irreconcilable antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat within this “people.”**

La lucha contra la remanencias semifeudales para acusar la lucha de clases y no unir al pueblo. Lenin y lo democrático-clasista, Lenin y una caracterización no semifeudal de una sociedad burguesa sin negar la existencia de formas de explotación capitalistas no clásicas. Un Lenin enfáticamente anti-populista. Pero aquí también está la semilla del programa semi-etapista de 1905...

Degeneración del populismo ruso (mantiene y entroniza el error de no dividir al campesinado en clases)

…to become convinced of the absurdity of picturing the "peasantry" as a single harmonious and homogeneous whole, to become convinced of the bourgeois character of all this progress! But the "friends of the people" remain deaf to all this. Having lost the good features of the old Russian social-revolutionary Narodism, they cling tightly to one of its grave errors—its failure to understand the class antagonism within the peasantry. "The peasantist [Narodnik] of 'the seventies,'" Hourwich aptly remarks, "had no idea of class antagonism within the ranks of the peasantry themselves, regarding it as confined entirely to the 'exploiter'—kulak or miroyed— and his victim, the peasant imbued with the communistic spirit.* Gleb Uspensky stood alone in his scepticism, op- posing his ironical smile to the universal illusion. With his perfect knowledge of the peasantry, and his extraordinary artistic talent that penetrated to the very heart of the phenomena, he did not fail to see that individualism had become the basis of economic relations, not only as between the usurer and the debtor, but among the peasants at large. Cf. his article "Casting in One Mould" (Ravneniye pod odno), Russkaya Mysl, 1882, No. 1." (Op. cit., p. 106.)

It was pardonable and even natural to succumb to this illusion in the sixties and seventies, when relatively accurate information about rural economy was so scarce, and when the differentiation of the peasantry had not yet become so marked, but today one must deliberately close one's eyes not to see this differentiation. It is extremely characteristic that it is precisely of late, when the ruin of the peasantry seems to have reached its peak, that one hears so much on all sides about progressive trends in peasant farming…And there you are—the "friends of the people" concentrate all their attention on the fact that the "muzhik" is feverishly searching for new methods of cultivation to help him fertilise the soil that feeds him— losing sight of the reverse side of the medal

El trabajo de hormiga y territorial que fetichizan los populistas y que comparten con Lavín y sus "necesidades concretas de la gente"

And they even elevate this modest, liberal patching up of the present order to a regular philosophy. "Minor, genuine activity," says Mr. Krivenko, with an air of profundity, "is much better than major inactivity." How new and clever! Moreover, he goes on to say, "minor activity is by no means synonymous with minor purpose."

Semilla semietapista y con relacionalidad lineal entre las clases en Lenin

All this, of course, is very lofty, humane and liberal— "liberal," because it will free the bourgeois economic system from all its medieval handicaps and thus make it easier for the worker to fight the system itself, which, of course, will be strengthened rather than hurt by such measures; and we have long been reading about all this in all Russian liberal publications.

Populismo ruso conjunta diferentes formas de populismo

i) Des desigual y comb entre economía y política crítico de un radicalismo (oportunista) que fetichiza la protección del trabajador por parte del Estado

As for the fathers and their ideals, it should be said that however erroneous and utopian the old theories of the Russian Narodniks were, at all events they were absolutely opposed to such "modest beginnings of liberalism." I have borrowed the latter expression from Mr. N. K. Mikhailovsky's article "About the Russian Edition of K. Marx's Book" (Otechestvenniye Zapiski, 1872, No. 4)… But that was long ago, so long ago that the ''friends of the people" have managed to forget all about it, and have glaringly demonstrated, by their tactics, that when there is no materialist criticism of political institutions, and when the class character of the modern state is not understood, it is only one step **from political radicalism to political opportunism…."The protection of the economically weak from the economically strong is the first natural task of state interference,"**… And so as to leave no doubt that his interpretation of this philanthropic nonsense* is the same as that of his worthy associates, the West-European liberal and radical petty-bourgeois ideologists

ii) Referenciamiento en el banco del pueblo de Proudhon, en Bismarck, en Gladstone

Gladstone's Land Bills, Bismarck's workers' insurance, factory inspection, the idea of our Peasants' Bank, the organisation of migration, measures against the kulak—all these are attempts to apply this same principle of stale interference for the protection of the economically weak."

The Gladstone Land Bills—the land laws adopted in Britain by Gladstone's Liberal Ministry in the 1870s and 1880s. With a view to mitigating the struggle between the tenant farmers and the landlords and to securing the votes of the former, the Gladstone government introduced some minor measures limiting the tyranny of the landlords, who had driven masses of tenants off the land. The government also promised to regulate the question of tenants' arrears, to set up special land courts that would establish "fair" rents, etc. The Gladstone Land Bills were typical of the social demagogy of the liberal bourgeoisie.

Ayudar a los pobres sufrientes desde arriba

iii) Un Estado por encima de las clases para una pequeña burguesía "reaccionaria"

In complete harmony with this, their fundamental theoretical tenet, is the fact that they regard as an instrument of reform an organ which has its basis in this present-day society and protects the interests of its ruling classes—the state. They positively believe the state

to be omnipotent and above all classes, and expect that it will not only “assist” the working people, but create a real and proper system (as we have heard from Mr. Krivenko).

For it is one of the fundamental and characteristic features of the petty bourgeoisie—one, incidentally, which makes it a reactionary class—that the petty producers, disunited and isolated by the very conditions of production and tied down to a definite place and to a definite exploiter, cannot understand the class character of the exploitation and oppression from which they suffer, and suffer sometimes no less than the proletarian; they cannot understand that in bourgeois society the state too is bound to be a class state

Contra el reformismo respecto del Estado, el cual no considera un instrumento, sino que por sí mismo emerge y está determinado por las relaciones entre las clases...

iv) Un Estado filo-semifeudal en Lenin, pero que desarrolla el mpc

Why is it then, most worthy “friends of the people,” that till now—and with particular energy since this very emancipator Reform—our government has “supported, protected and created” only the bourgeoisie and capitalism? Why is it that such unseemly conduct on the part of this absolute, allegedly supraclass, government has coincided precisely with a historical period characterised in the country’s internal life by the development of commodity economy, commerce and industry?

(Nota al pie) That is why the “friends of the people” are arch-reactionaries when they say that it is the state’s natural task to protect the economically weak (that is what it should be according to their banal old wives’ morality), whereas Russia’s entire history and home policy testify that the task of our state is to protect only the feudal landlords and the big bourgeoisie, and to punish with the utmost brutality every attempt of the “economically weak” to stand up for their rights. And that, of course, is its natural task, because absolutism and the bureaucracy are thoroughly saturated with the feudalbourgeois spirit, and because in the economic sphere the bourgeoisie hold undivided sway and keep the workers “as quiet as lambs.”

El estado "semifeudal" (ver nota al pie) en realidad solo ha fortalecido y desarrollado el capitalismo a la burguesía (es un estado moderno-capitalista, como el mismo Marx lo describe en su carta a Danielson de 1879...cierto grado de asistematicidad en Lenin
Desarrollando y modificando la tesis central de Rusia como país burgués: si bien se habla de que en la esfera económica la burguesía domina completamente, a nivel estatal se deja espacio para tesis semifeudales (se sugiere parcialmente la idea de un estado capitalista-feudal burocrático...)
Semilla vanguardista y marcusiana en Lenin (obreros como corderos)

“Sobrevivencias feudales” en Lenin…

…a discrepancy between the payments and the income from the land, i.e., a direct survival of feudal quitrent?

Un intelligentsia servil…(pero como tesis secundaria)

This is another phrase classic for its shameless servility…

Lenin contra el reformismo burgués

i) Contra el posibilismo

This liberal starts out by pleading with the authorities to grant reforms "as far as possible," then he goes on to beg for "well, at least something," and ends by taking up an eternal and unshakable stand on "anything, however mean."

ii) Contra la mera reducción de la pobreza

…and these gentlemen will write in the same old way: you see, 40 and not 50 million are starving, that is because the government has eased the people's burden and has saved them from utter ruin;…

Lenin abraza la caracterización romántica del populismo ruso tipo Cernychevsky hecha por Kautsky (que no es la Marx, ni tampoco la de Plejanov)

…the theories and teachings of Herzen and Chernyshevsky…What were actually the ideals of the first Russian socialists, the socialists of the epoch which Kautsky so aptly described in the words:

"When every socialist was a poet and every poet a socialist."

Faith in a special social order, in the communal system of Russian life; hence—faith in the possibility of a peasant socialist revolution—that is what inspired them and roused dozens and hundreds of people to wage a heroic struggle

Populismo revolucionario de Cernychevsky se divide y en los 1890s: socialismo obrero vs populismo degenerado (reformismo liberal-burgués)

…the countryside is indeed splitting up. Nay more, the countryside long ago split up completely. And the old Russian peasant socialism split up with it, making way for workers' socialism, on the one hand, and degenerating into vulgar petty-bourgeois radicalism, on the other. This change cannot be described as anything but degeneration. From the doctrine that peasant life is a special social order and that our country has taken an exceptional path of development, there has emerged a sort of diluted eclecticism, which can no longer deny that commodity economy has become the basis of economic development and has grown into capitalism, but which refuses to see the bourgeois character of all the relations of production, refuses to see the necessity of the class struggle under this system. From a political programme calculated to arouse the peasantry for the socialist revolution against the foundations of modern society* there has emerged a programme calculated to patch up, to "improve" the conditions of the peasantry while preserving the foundations of modern society

La degeneración del populismo. Lenin describe un proceso similar al que nosotros teorizamos respecto del populismo ciudadanista. Pero en el caso ruso la variante populista que va hacia el marxismo logra pasar a una posición clasista negando su populismo. **Esto está relacionado con el anti-ciudadanismo del populismo de Cernychevsky y su materailismo (recordar algunos extractos de Plejanov al respecto de 1885, la crítica de Cernychevsky a Stuart Mill, etc)**

Caracterización de la carta de Marx de 1877 (debate Mikhailovsky)

i) El populismo degenerado se toma de ella para fundamentar su espeicifismo campesinista

Often we get downright distortions. Mr. Krivenko, for example, declares that Marx "admitted that, if we desired it" (?!! So, according to Marx, the evolution of social and economic relations depends on human will and consciousness?? What is this—abysmal ignorance or unparalleled effrontery?!), "and acted accordingly, we could avoid the vicissitudes of capitalism and proceed by a different and more expedient path (sic!!!)."… "K. Marx's Letter"… Marx speaks of his high esteem for Chernyshevsky…Mr. Krivenko closes the quotation marks, i.e., ends the reproduction of what Marx actually said (the last words of which were: "he [Chernyshevsky] pronounces in favour of this latter solution")—and adds: "And I, says Marx, share" (Krivenko's italics) "these views" (p. 186, No. 12).

ii) Lenin subraya a un Marx no grandilocuente que pontifica sobre todo (reconcoe la necesidad de estudiar científica antes el problema)

What Marx actually said was this: "And my honourable critic would have had at least as much reason for inferring from my esteem for this 'great Russian scholar and critic' that I shared his views on the question, as for concluding from my polemic against the Russian 'literary man' and Pan-Slavist that I rejected them." (Yuridichesky Vestnik, 1888, No. 10, p. 271.)… Marx's statement quoted above shows quite clearly that he evaded the question as such…And in order that these remarks should provide no occasion for misinterpretation, Marx, in this very same "letter," gave a direct reply to the question of how his theory could be applied to Russia. This reply very clearly shows that Marx avoided answering the question as such, avoided examining Russian data, which alone could decide the question: "If Russia," he replied, "is tending to become a capitalist nation on the pattern of the West-European countries—and during the last years she has been taking much trouble in this respect—she will not succeed without having first transformed a good part of her peasants into proletarians."

Engels subraya lo mismo en 1891

iii) Lenin y el énfasis en el marxismo como programa de investigación en desarrollo (ejemplo en "Nuestras diferencias" de 1885)

In other words, Marx's theory is to investigate and explain the evolution of the economic system of certain countries, and its "application" to Russia can be only the

INVESTIGATION of Russian production relations and their evolution, EMPLOYING the established practices of the MATERIALIST method and of THEORETICAL political economy.

(Nota al pie) I repeat that this conclusion could not but be clear to anybody who had read the Communist Manifesto, The Poverty of Philosophy, and Capital, and that a special explanation was required only for the benefit of Mr. Mikhailovsky.

…after the appearance of Capital "the destiny of capitalism in Russia" became the principal theoretical problem for Russian socialists; the most heated debates raged around this problem, and the most important points of programme were decided in accordance with it. And it is noteworthy that when (some ten years ago) a separate group of socialists appeared who answered in the affirmative the question of whether Russia's evolution was capitalist, and based this answer on the data of Russian economic reality, it encountered no direct and definite criticism of the point at issue,

Cuestiones de partido y organización

i) Énfasis en el debate partidario pero manteniendo un núcleo estructural de tesis compartidas (rechazo tesis semifeudal, lucha de clases desde la independencia obrera, Estado es una institución clasista)

It is true that complete unanimity does not reign among the Marxists. But, firstly, Mr. Mikhailovsky misrepresents this fact; and, secondly, it demonstrates the strength and vitality of Russian Social- Democracy and not its weakness. A particularly characteristic feature of the recent period is that socialists are arriving at Social-Democratic views by various paths and for that reason, while unreservedly agreeing on the fundamental and principal thesis that Russia is a bourgeois society which has grown out of the feudal system, that its political form is a class state, and that the only way to end the exploitation of the working people is through the class struggle of the proletariat—they differ on many particular problems both in their methods of argument and in the detailed interpretation of this or that phenomenon of Russian life…the peasant Reform, the economics of peasant farming and handicraft industries, land renting, etc. The unanimity of people who content themselves with the unanimous acceptance of "lofty truths" such as: the peasant Reform might open for Russia peaceful paths of proper development

ii) Centralismo democrático y unidad de acción en el seno del partido "social demócrata"

And if such work—while leading people from different angles to the acceptance of the common position which undoubtedly dictates joint political action and consequently confers on all who accept it the right and duty to call themselves "SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS"—still leaves a wide field for differences of opinion on a host of particular problems open to various solutions, it merely demonstrates, of course, the strength and vitality of Russian Social-Democracy

ii) Desfetichizando el debate partidario para no convertirlo en discusión entre marxistas de salón propio del neomarxismo liberal

For the simple reason that no solution of these problems has so far been found…

Moreover, it would be hard to imagine anything more difficult than the conditions under which this work is being done: there is not, nor can there be, an organ to unite the various aspects of the work; in view of prevailing police conditions, private intercourse is extremely difficult. It is only natural that Social-Democrats cannot properly discuss and reach agreement on details, that they contradict each other

Mr. Krivenko's references, in his "polemic" against the Social-Democrats, to "neo-Marxists" may cause some perplexity. Some readers may think that something in the nature of a split has taken place among the Social-Democrats, and that "neo-Marxists" have broken away from the old Social-Democrats. Nothing of the kind. At no time or place has anybody in a public defence of Marxism criticised the theories and programme of Russian Social-Democracy, or advocated any other kind of Marxism. The fact is that Messrs. Krivenko and Mikhailovsky have been listening to drawing-room gossip about the Marxists, have been observing various liberals who use Marxism to cover up their liberal inanity, and, with their characteristic cleverness and tact, have set out with this stock-in-trade to "criticise" the Marxists….This idle liberal chatter is to be found in the Destiny of Capitalism, the work of "our well-known" Mr. V. V

Es Lenin el primero que frasea la crítica a la burguesía como crítica al liberalismo (Marx y Engels no lo frasean así, Kautsky menos todavía) –y esta es una herencia de Cernychevsky

iv) Necesario un quiebre fundamental con el ciudadanismo (democracia y socialismo se separan)

Did it pay to argue so long with such gentlemen?... I think it was, not for their sake, of course, or for the sake of the "cultured" public, but for the useful lesson which Russian socialists can and should learn from this onslaught.
It provides most striking and most convincing proof that the period of Russia's social development, when democracy and socialism were merged in one inseparable and indissoluble whole (as was the case, for example, in Chernyshevsky's day), has gone never to return. Today there are absolutely no grounds for the idea, which Russian socialists here and there still cling to and which most harmfully affects their theories and practical work, that there is no profound qualitative difference in Russia between the ideas of the democrats and those of the socialists.
Quite the contrary; a wide gulf divides these ideas, and it is high time the Russian socialists understood this, understood that a COMPLETE and FINAL RUPTURE with the ideas of the democrats is INEVITABLE and IMPERATIVE!
(…) peasant Reform. What attitude towards it had Chernyshevsky, a democrat of that epoch, when democracy and socialism were undivided?

(…)The “friends of the people” have forgotten this antagonism; they have lost all sensibility of the fact that in this country, too, in Holy Russia, the pure-blooded bourgeois hide “under the cloak of democracy”; and that is why they are now reactionary (in relation to the proletariat), for they gloss over the antagonism, and talk, not of struggle, but of conciliatory, “uplift” activity

El primer Lenin ante todo anticuidadanista (como el Marx de 1850) y comunista (no socialdemócrata) –muy distinto y opuesto al desarrollo del concepto socialdemocracia por Liebknecht en 1875, de ahí que la adherencia de Lenin se una meramente terminológica. Diferencia de clase irreconciliable con la pequeñaburguesía

Retener que esta separación entre democracia y socialismo es precisamente la que hace Marx en 1850, así como Kautsky y Guesde intentan restituir apelando a la pequeñaburguesía (y sobre todo Kautsky con su programa político que es solamente burgués, con su idea de que para politizar al proletariado hay que desobrerizarlo, etc)

Pequeña referencia a los organizadores del proceso de trabajo

Krivenko, who, for example, in his eagerness to annihilate the hated Social-Democracy, relates that “some go into the factories (when, of course, they can get soft jobs as technicians or office workers)

Degeneración del populismo ruso (de lo revolucionario a liberal-oportunista)

Only it is not Narodism at all (in the old, customary meaning of that term), and its success and tremendously widespread character have been achieved at the cost of vulgarising Narodism, converting social-revolutionary Narodism, which was sharply opposed to our liberalism, into uplift opportunism, that merges with this liberalism and expresses only the interests of the petty bourgeoisie

i) Teórica (del populismo revolucionario al ciudadanismo explotador)

Let us dwell a little on the process which led to this degeneration of Narodism…The development of the theory, therefore, proceeded along the two lines, the theoretical and the practical. The theoretical work was directed mainly towards studying that form of landownership in which they wanted to see the rudiments of communism; and this work yielded a wealth of factual material of the most varied kind….All the investigators’ attention was concentrated on studying these hardships—land poverty, high payments, lack of rights, and the crushed and downtrodden condition of the peasants

The naïve investigators, believing in the possibility of “convincing” society and the state, were completely submerged in the details of the facts they had collected, and lost sight of one thing, the political-economic structure of the countryside, lost sight of the main background of the economy that really was being crushed by these immediate hardships. The result, naturally, was that defence of the interests of an economy crushed by land poverty, etc., turned out to be a defence of the interests of the class that held this

economy in its hands, that alone could endure and develop under the given social-economic relations within the community, under the given economic system in the country.
Theoretical work directed towards the study of the institution which was to serve as the basis and support for the abolition of exploitation led to a programme being drawn up which expresses the interests of the petty bourgeoisie, i.e., the very class upon which this system of exploitation rests!

ii) Práctica (de "ir hacia el pueblo" a luchar por libertades burguesas)

…practical revolutionary work also developed in quite an unexpected direction…but practice convinced them of the naïveté of the idea of the muzhik's instincts being communist. It was decided, incidentally, that they did not have to do with the muzhik, but with the government—and the entire activity was then concentrated on a fight against the government…**Latterly, this theory is apparently becoming utterly discredited, and the struggle waged by the Narodovoltsi against the government is becoming a struggle of the radicals for political liberty**.
Hence, in this case, too, the work led to results diametrically opposite to its point of departure; in this case, too, there emerged a programme expressing only the interests of radical bourgeois democracy

iii) Mientras Cernychevsky criticó la reforma a la servdumbre de 1861 (antes y después de su aplicación), sus herederos la celebran 30 años depués…

Chernyshevsky understood that the Russian feudal, bureaucratic state was incapable of emancipating the peasants, that is, of overthrowing the feudal serf owners, that it was only capable of something "vile," of a miserable compromise between the interests of the liberals (redemption is nothing but purchase) and of the landlords, a compromise employing the illusion of security and freedom to deceive the peasants, but actually ruining them and completely betraying them to the landlords. And he protested, execrated the Reform, wanted it to fail, wanted the government to get tied up in its equilibristics between the liberals and the landlords, and wanted a crash to take place that would bring Russia out on the high road of open class struggle.

Yet today, when Chernyshevsky's brilliant predictions have become fact, when the history of the past thirty years has ruthlessly shown up all economic and political illusions, our contemporary "democrats" sing the praises of the Reform, regard it as a sanction for "people's" production, contrive to draw proof from it of the possibility of finding a way which would get around the social classes hostile to the working people. I repeat, their attitude towards the peasant Reform is most striking proof of how profoundly bourgeois our democrats have become. These gentlemen have learned nothing, but have forgotten very, very much

Sobre el campesinado como clase (lo era bajo el mpf, pero bajo el mpc se divide en clases antagónicas...)

(…) to stimulate the peasants to revolution were so unsuccessful— whether it was because they erroneously believed that the "peasantry" really represented the working people and exploited population, whereas in fact the peasantry does not constitute a single class (—an illusion only to be explained, perhaps, by the reflected influence of the epoch of the fall of serfdom, when the peasantry did indeed come forward as a class, but only as a class of feudal society), for within it a bourgeois and a proletarian class are forming

Sobre la tesis semifeudal

i) En los 1860s la nobleza feudal recibió un golpe decisivo

At that time, in the era of the "sixties," the power of the feudal landlords was sapped: they suffered defeat, not complete, it is true, but so decisive that they had to slink from the stage

ii) El ciudadanismo que reclama contra las injusticias desde lo popular se alza mientras la nobleza feudal declina (1860s)

Streams of liberal phrase-mongering flowed about progress, science, goodness, struggle against injustice, the interests of the people, the conscience of the people, the forces of the people, etc., etc.—the very phrases which now, too, at moments of particular depression, are vomited forth by our radical snivellers in their salons, and by our liberal phrase-mongers at their anniversary dinners, and in the columns of their magazines and newspapers

iii) El triunfo liberal de los 1860s solo develó la forma de explotación burguesa que se desarrolló aún más

The liberals proved strong enough to mould the "new order" in their own fashion—not entirely, of course, but in fair measure….so that even those ideologists of the working people who had not the faintest notion of this class struggle, and who preferred to dream of a better future rather than explain the vile present, could not help seeing that liberalism was a cloak for plutocracy, and that the new order was a bourgeois order. It was the removal from the stage of the feudal landlords, who did not divert attention to still more crying evils of the day, and did not prevent the new order from being observed in its pure (relatively) form, that enabled this to be seen.

iv) Lenin y una sociedad burguesa rusa en la cual las clases feudales pueden volver a reemerger...

And then history showed them these other social relations. The feudal landlords, not completely crushed by the Reform, which was so outrageously mutilated in their interests, revived (for a time) and showed vividly what these other than bourgeois social relations of ours were, showed it in the form of such unbridled, incredibly senseless and brutal

reaction that our democrats caught fright, subsided, instead of advancing…went backwards, to the liberals

La pequeña burguesía populista como reaccionaria

i) Se presenta como representante del pueblo trabajador

Today, the theories of these petty-bourgeois ideologists, when they come forward as the spokesmen of the interests of the working people, are positively reactionary.

ii) Es ciudadanista y reformista

They obscure the antagonism of contemporary Russian social-economic relations and argue as if things could be improved by general measures, applicable to all, for "raising," "improving," etc., and as if it were possible to reconcile and unite.

iii) Es ciudadanista y caritativa (ayuda desde arriba)

They are reactionary in depicting our state as something standing above classes and therefore fit and capable of rendering serious and honest aid to the exploited population.

iv) Niegan toda lucha y buscan solucionar las cosas por arriba de forma tecnocrática

They are reactionary, lastly, because they simply cannot understand the necessity for a struggle, a desperate struggle of the working people themselves for their emancipation. The "friends of the people," for example, seem to think they can manage the whole thing themselves

v) Necesario un quiebre pleno con ella

Socialists must make a DECISIVE and COMPLETE break with all petty-bourgeois ideas and theories—THAT IS THE PRINCIPAL USEFUL LESSON to be drawn from this campaign

vi) Un quiebre con sus ideas, no con ellos (un quiebre con sus fundamentos en el populismo revolucionario pasado)

I ask you to note that I speak of a break with pettybourgeois ideas and not with the "friends of the people" or with their ideas—because there can be no breaking with something with which there has never-been any connection. The "friends of the people" are only one of the representatives of one of the trends of this sort of petty-bourgeois socialist ideas… Comparing these ideas with contemporary socialism and with
the facts of contemporary Russian reality, we see with astonishing clarity how outworn these ideas have become, how they have lost every vestige of an integral theoretical basis and have sunk to the level of a pitiful eclecticism, of a most ordinary opportunist

uplift programme. It may be said that this is not the fault of the old socialist ideas in general, but of the gentlemen in question, whom no one thinks of classing as socialists; but such an argument seems to me quite unsound. I have throughout tried to show that such a degeneration of the old theories was inevitable. I have throughout tried to devote as little space as possible to criticism of these gentlemen in particular and as much as possible to the general and fundamental tenets of the old Russian socialism

Pequeña burguesía puede ser progresiva cuando permanence democrática y no pretende ser socialista (centreo asistemático en Lenin)

The petty-bourgeois theories we have examined are ABSOLUTELY reactionary INASMUCH AS they claim to be socialist theories...

i) Remarcando los elementos semifeudales y rebajando la democracia a mera reivindicación burguesa (qué es la defensa de la posición social?)

…what should be the attitude of the working class towards the petty bourgeoisie and its programmes? And this question cannot be answered unless the dual character of this class is taken into consideration (here in Russia this duality is particularly marked owing to the antagonism between the big bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie being less developed). It is progressive insofar as it puts forward general democratic demands, i.e., fights against all survivals of the medieval epoch and of serfdom; it is reactionary insofar as it fights to preserve its position as a petty bourgeoisie and tries to retard, to turn back the general development of the country along bourgeois lines. Reactionary demands of this kind, such, for example, as the notorious inalienability of allotments, as well as the many other projects for tutelage over the peasants, are usually covered up by plausible talk of protecting the working people but actually, of course, they only worsen their condition, while at the same time hampering them in their struggle for emancipation

Lenin y el rebajamiento de la democracia a nivel burgués, lo cual a la vez coincide con un otorgamiento (asistemático, porque antes se afirmó la dominancia plena del mpc en Rusia) de una importancia mayor a la presencia de las formas semifeudales. Lenin y la inexistencia parcial de lo democrático-clasista.
Reflexión sobre qué es intentar "mantener la posición social". En este sentido, varias de las prácticas populares en realidad mantienen la posición social de la pequeñaburguesía pero no necesariamente luchan contra lo feudal de modo directo (créditos, maquinaria). Solo la mantención de la propiedad de la tierra (su no mercantilización) mantiene formas de explotación "semifeudales...

ii) Inexistencia de lo democrático-clasista en Lenin (tierra, impuestos, derechos civiles)

…although the Marxists completely repudiate petty-bourgeois theories, this does not prevent them from including democracy in their programme, but, on the contrary, calls for still stronger insistence on it. We have mentioned above the three main theses that

always formed the theoretical stock-in-trade of the representatives of petty-bourgeois socialism, viz., land poverty, high payments and the tyranny of the authorities

Las demandas democráticas de Lenin en 1894: tierrra, impuestos y derechos civiles
(no existe lo democrático-clasista, y la acusación de la lucha de clases que supone esta democracia parece sobre impuesta....)
Muy distinto al Lenin de 1917 (tierra, pan, trabajo, paz, AC, control obrero)
Incluso distinto al Lenin de 1905 (que incluía AC)

iii) ¿Cómo puede acusarse la lucha de clases mediante un programa democrático que explícitamente remarca no afecta la explotación del obrero?

There is absolutely nothing socialist in the demand for the abolition of these evils, for they do not in the least explain expropriation and exploitation, and their elimination will not in the least affect the oppression of labour by capital. But their elimination will free this oppression of the medieval rubbish that aggravates it, and will facilitate the worker's direct struggle against capital, and for that reason, as a democratic demand, will meet with the most energetic support of the workers.

La inexistencia plena de lo democrático clasista predicada sobre la tesis de los restos feudales. Asistematicidad: si no afectan la explotación del obrero y su relación con el patrón capitalista, ¿cómo es que pueden acusar la lucha de clases? ¿No era que existía doble explotación y mezcla entre formas "feudales" y capitalistas?...

iv) "Impuestos" y "tierra" solo requerdios por la reintroducción de lo semifeudal

Generally speaking, the question of payments and taxes is one to which only the petty bourgeois can attach any particular significance; but in Russia the payments made by the peasants are, in many respects, simply survivals of serfdom. Such, for example, are the land redemption payments, which should be immediately and unconditionally abolished; such, too, are the taxes which only the peasants and the small townspeople pay, but from which the "gentry" are exempt. Social-Democrats will always support the demand for the elimination of these relics of medieval relations, which cause economic and political stagnation. The same can be said of land poverty

La cuestión de los impuestos es criticada por Marx y Engels ya en 1847 a Heinzen (y en este Lenin solo se afirma por la remanencia de la reforma de 1861 -no pareciera ser estructural como para mantenerse hasta 1905) (solo se lo incluye por su cuestión feudal)… solo por la existencia de remanente semifeudales se justifica la existencia de las reivindicaciones democráticas...(por ue se confunde lo democrático con lo burgués y se fetichiza su carácter antifeudal)

v) Nacionalización de la tierra como demanda mínima (no hay jerarquización de reivindicaicones en el seno del programa mínimo)

…complete abolition of landed proprietorship—that bulwark of feudal institutions and traditions. This latter point, which coincides with the nationalisation of the land, contains nothing socialist, because the capitalist-farming relations already taking shape in our country would in that case only flourish more rapidly and abundantly; but it is extremely important from the democratic standpoint as the only measure capable of completely breaking the power of the landed nobility

Ya está aquí la nacionalización de la tierra, cuestión que se presenta como mera demanda mínima y similar a la cuestión de los impuestos (no hay jerarquización entre las demandas mínimas). Engels, en cambio, reivindicó la estatización de la tierra para la Alemania de 1884 en un sentido transicional camino al socialismo....
Nuevamente, solo se demanda la nacionalización de la tierra porque se cree presentes a elementos feudales...

vi) La demanda política ni siquiera consigna el cuestionamiento del zarismo (que Plejanov ya consigno en 1887 y afirmó con más fuerza en 1889)

…oppression; it is treating the peasants as a “base rabble… And the Social-Democrats unreservedly associate themselves with the demand for the complete restoration of the peasants’ civil rights, the complete abolition of all the privileges of the nobility, the abolition of bureaucratic tutelage over the peasants, and the peasants’ right to manage their own affairs

Ni siquiera hay derechos políticos, menos todavía sufragio, sino solo una suerte de autonomismo campesino...No hay jerarquización ya esto se considera igual a nacionalización de la tierra (y tener en cuenta que Engels precisamente critica este tipo de reivindicaciones hacia el final de "Prussian Schnapps in the Reichstag")

vii) Unidad social-demócrata pero predicada sobre la base de darle gran peso a los elementos feudales en Rusia

In general, the Russian communists, adherents of Marxism, should more than any others call themselves SOCIALDEMOCRATS, and in their activities should never forget the enormous importance of DEMOCRACY.**

In Russia, the relics of medieval, semi-feudal institutions are still so enormously strong (as compared with Western Europe), they are such an oppressive yoke upon the proletariat and the people generally, retarding the growth of political thought in all estates and classes, that one cannot but insist on the tremendous importance which the struggle against all feudal institutions, absolutism, the socialestate system, and the bureaucracy has for the workers.

viii) Lenin no deja de darse cuenta que las formas feudales se combinan con las capitalistas bajo la dominancia de las segundas (desarrolllo desigual y combinado)

The workers must be shown in the greatest detail what a terribly reactionary force these institutions are, how they intensify the oppression of labour by capital, what a degrading pressure they exert on the working people, how they keep capital in its medieval forms, which, while not falling short of the modern, industrial forms in respect of the exploitation of labour, add to this exploitation by placing terrible difficulties in the way of the fight for emancipation.

ix) Lucha contra los elementos feudales solo está predicada para unificar a la clase obrera y buscar unir a su sección urbana con las secciones agrarias más dificultadas en su accionar político y económico-social

The workers must know that unless these pillars of reaction* are overthrown, it will be utterly impossible for them to wage a successful struggle against the bourgeoisie, because so long as they exist, the Russian rural proletariat, whose support is an essential condition for the victory of the working class, will never cease to be downtrodden and cowed, capable only of sullen desperation and not of intelligent and persistent protest and struggle.

x) Se idealiza a la democracia radical como necesariamente antiburguesa

And that is why it is the direct duty of the working class to fight side by side with the radical democracy against absolutism and the reactionary social estates and institutions—

xi) Se opera con la errada idea de que el capital debe ser política democrático...

…a duty which the Social-Democrats must impress upon the workers, while not for a moment ceasing also to impress upon them that the struggle against all these institutions is necessary only as a means of facilitating the struggle against the bourgeoisie, that the worker needs the achievement of the general democratic demands only to clear the road to victory over the working people's chief enemy, over an institution that is purely democratic by nature, capital, which here in Russia is particularly in clined to sacrifice its democracy and to enter into alliance with the reactionaries in order to suppress the workers, to still further impede the emergence of a working-class movement

xii) Lenin cerca de la idea de que los marxistas debe impulsar el desarrollo de un partido democrático

…late, that aims at the "amalgamation" and "alliance" of all the revolutionary groups for the winning of political liberty… But what is characteristic is that this "amalgamation" trend represents one of the last stages in the process of transformation of militant, revolutionary Narodism into politically radical democracy, a process which I have tried to outline above. A durable amalgamation of all the non-Social-Democratic revolutionary groups under the banner mentioned will be possible only when a durable programme of democratic demands has been drawn up that will put an end to the prejudices of the old Russian exceptionalism. Of course, the Social-Democrats believe that the formation of such a democratic party would be a useful step forward; and their anti-Narodnik activity should

further it, should further the eradication of all prejudices and myths, the grouping of the socialists under the banner of Marxism and the formation of a democratic party by the other groups

Lenin refers to the Narodnoye Pravo (People's Right) party, an illegal organisation of the Russian democratic intelligentsia founded in the summer of 1893. Among the founders were such former Narodovoltsi as O. V. Aptekman, A. I. Bogdanovich, A. V. Gedeonovsky, M. A. Natanson and N. S. Tyutchev. The members of the Narodnoye Pravo set themselves the aim of uniting all opposition forces, with a view to conducting a struggle for political reform. The Narodnoye Pravo party issued two programme documents, a "Manifesto" and "An Urgent Issue." In the spring of 1894 the party was broken up by the tsarist government. For Lenin's assessment of Narodnoye Pravo as a political party see pages 329-32 of the present volume, and also the pamphlet The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats (Vol. 2). The majority of the Narodnoye Pravo members subsequently joined the Socialist Revolutionary Party.

xiii) Lenin y la inconsistenia de demandarle a los partidos democráticos que sean democrático-burgueses sin ser ciudadanistas

The Social-Democrats, who consider essential the independent organisation of the workers into a separate workers' party, could not, of course, "amalgamate" with such a party, but the workers would most strongly support any struggle waged by the democrats against reactionary institutions.
The degeneration of Narodism into the most ordinary petty-bourgeois radical theory—of which (degeneration) the "friends of the people" furnish such striking testimony—shows what a tremendous mistake is made by those who spread among the workers the idea of fighting absolutism without at the same time explaining to them the antagonistic character of our social relations by virtue of which the ideologists of the bourgeoisie also favour political liberty—without explaining to them the historical role of the Russian worker as a fighter for the emancipation of the whole working population

Obviously, under such conditions to call upon the worker to fight for political liberty would be equivalent to calling upon him to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the progressive bourgeoisie, for it cannot be denied (typically enough, even the Narodniks and the Narodovoltsi did not deny it) that political liberty will primarily serve the interests of the bourgeoisie and will not ease the position of the workers, but ... will ease only the conditions for their struggle ... against this very bourgeoisie.

<u>Lenin contra la burocracia (burguesa, venal y aumenta la explotación del obrero)</u>

(…) (Nota al pie)* A particularly imposing reactionary institution, one to which our revolutionaries have paid relatively little attention, is our bureaucracy, which de facto rules the Russian state. The bureaucracy being made up mainly of middle-class intellectuals are profoundly bourgeois both in origin and in the purpose and character of their activities; but absolutism and the enormous political privileges of the landed nobility have lent them particularly pernicious qualities. They are regular weathercocks, who regard it as their supreme task to combine the interests of the landlord and the bourgeois. They are Judushkas who use their feudal sympathies and connections to fool the workers and peasants, and employ the pretext of "protecting the economically weak" and acting as their "guardian" against the kulak and usurer to carry through measures which reduce the

working people to the status of a “base rabble,” handing them over to the feudal landlords and making them all the more defenceless against the bourgeoisie. The bureaucracy are most dangerous hypocrites, who have imbibed the experience of the West-European champion reactionaries

…Volviendo al ruedo clasista

i) Partido obrero socialista no lucha junto a toda la intelligentsia (semilla del cambio de época Trotsky arca en 1848… en 1906)

The theory of these socialists contradicts their practice, and they make a very serious mistake by distracting the workers from their direct task of ORGANISING A SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY.*
It was a mistake that arose naturally at a time when the class antagonisms of bourgeois society were still quite undeveloped and were held down by serfdom, when the latter was evoking the unanimous protest and struggle of the entire intelligentsia, thus creating the illusion that there was something peculiarly democratic about our intelligentsia, and that there was no profound gulf between the ideas of the liberals and of the socialists. Now that economic development has advanced so far that even those who formerly denied a basis for capitalism in Russia admit our having entered the capitalist path of development—illusions on this score are no longer possible.

ii) La mercantilización propia del mpc ha prdoucido una intelligentsia carrerista y satisfecha

The composition of the “intelligentsia” is assuming just as clear an outline as that of society engaged in the production of material values: while the latter is ruled and governed by the capitalist, among the former the fashion is set by the rapidly growing horde of careerists and bourgeois hirelings, an “intelligentsia” contented and satisfied, a stranger to all wild fantasy and very well aware of what they want

iii) Contra la lucha de “todo el pueblo contra el absolutismo”

(Nota al pie)* There are two ways of arriving at the conclusion that the worker must be roused to fight absolutism: either by regarding the worker as the sole fighter for the socialist system, and therefore seeing political liberty as one of the conditions facilitating his struggle; that is the view of the Social-Democrats; or by appealing to him simply as the one who suffers most from the present system, who has nothing more to lose and who can display the greatest determination in fighting absolutism. But that would mean compelling the worker to drag in the wake of the bourgeois radicals, who refuse to see the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat behind the solidarity of the whole “people” against absolutism.

iv) Buena crítica a la intelligentsia burguesa...por qué buscar que ea democrática si es y no puede ser otra cosa que burguesa?

Far from denying this fact, our radicals and liberals strongly emphasise it and go out of their way to prove its immorality, to condemn it, strive to confound it, shame it ... and destroy it. These naïve efforts to make the bourgeois intelligentsia ashamed of being bourgeois

v) Asistematicidad en Lenin: ahora casi niega la existencia de feudalism para rechazar la alianza con la intelligentsia

Beyond these bounds begin the liberal and radical "intelligentsia," who pour out innumerable phrases about progress, science, truth, the people, etc., and who love to lament the passing of the sixties, when there was no discord, depression, despondency and apathy, and when all hearts were aflame with democracy.
With their characteristic simplicity, these gentlemen refuse to understand that the cause of the unanimity that then prevailed was the then existing material conditions, gone never to return: serfdom pressed down everybody equally— the serf steward who had saved a little money and wanted to live in comfort; the enterprising muzhik, who hated the lord for exacting tribute, for interfering in and tearing him from his business; the proletarianised manor-serf and the impoverished muzhik who was sold into bondage to the merchant; it brought suffering to the merchant manufacturer and the worker, the handicraftsman and the subcontractor. The only tie that linked all these people together was their hostility to serfdom; beyond that unanimity, the sharpest economic antagonism began. How completely one must be lulled by sweet illusions not to perceive this antagonism even today when it has become so enormously developed; to weep for the return of the days of unanimity at a time when the situation demands struggle, demands that everyone who does not want to be a WILLING or UNWILLING myrmidon of the bourgeoisie shall take his stand on the side of the proletariat

Ciencia, estrategia y organización

i) Escribir para la intelligentsia

We cannot but be grateful to the "friends of the people" for having done much to reveal the class character of our intelligentsia and for having thereby fortified the Marxist theory that our small producers are petty bourgeois…And in this strain they talk about a "people's system" and the "intelligentsia"—talk, not only with a serious air, but in pretentious, stupendous phrases about broad ideals, about an ideal treatment of the problems of life!... The socialist intelligentsia can expect to perform fruitful work only when they abandon their illusions and begin to seek support in the actual, and not the desired development of Russia

ii) El marxismo como programa de investigación en desarrollo

Moreover, their THEORETICAL work must be directed towards the concrete study of all forms of economic antagonism in Russia, the study of their connections and successive development; they must reveal this antagonism wherever it has been concealed by political history, by the peculiarities of legal systems or by established theoretical

prejudice. They must present an integral picture of our realities as a definite system of production relations, show that the exploitation and expropriation of the working people are essential under this system, and show the way out of this system that is indicated by economic development.

iii) Busca crear cuadros y científicos marxistas desde el mismo seno de la clase obrera (el Lenin antivanguardista burgués)

This theory, based on a detailed study of Russian history and realities, must furnish an answer to the demands of the proletariat—and if it satisfies the requirements of science, then every awakening of the protesting thought of the proletariat will inevitably guide this thought into the channels of Social-Democracy.The greater the progress made in elaborating this theory, the more rapidly will Social- Democracy grow; for even the most artful guardians of the present system cannot prevent the awakening of proletarian thought, because this system itself necessarily and inevitably entails the most intense expropriation of the producers, the continuous growth of the proletariat and of its reserve army—and this parallel to the progress of social wealth, the enormous growth of the productive forces, and the socialisation of labour by capitalism.

Pero no por ello no sabe que tiene que partir en la intelligenstia socialista por una cuestión de situación y circunstancia...Muy distinto al Kautsky de Erfurt

iv) El marxismo explícita como programa de investigación en desarrollo, pero con un núcleo duro materialista de análisis (el Lenin antidogmático)

However much has still to be done to elaborate this theory, the socialists will do it; this is guaranteed by the spread among them of materialism, the only scientific method, one requiring that every programme shall be a precise formulation of the actual process; it is guaranteed by the success of Social-Democracy, which has adopted these ideas—a success which has so stirred up our liberals and democrats that, as a certain Marxist has put it, their monthly magazines have ceased to be dull.

v) Solo el antiutopismo lleva a la plantearse de lleno el problema de la organización

In thus emphasising the necessity, importance and immensity of the theoretical work of the Social-Democrats, by no means want to say that this work should take precedence over PRACTICAL work,*—still less that the latter should be postponed until the former is completed… Of course, if it is presumed that the task of the socialists is to seek “different” (from actual) “paths of development” for the country, then, naturally, practical work becomes possible only when philosophical geniuses discover and indicate these “different paths”

vi) La organización para desarrollar la teoría, la lucha ideológica para desarrollar la teoría en sentido científico

(Nota al pie) **On the contrary, the practical work of propaganda and agitation must always take precedence, because, firstly, theoretical work only supplies answers to the problems raised by practical work**, and, secondly, the Social-Democrats, for reasons over which they have no control, are so often compelled to confine themselves to theoretical work that they value highly every moment when practical work is possible

The position is altogether different when the task of the socialists is to be the ideological leaders of the proletariat in its actual struggle against actual and real enemies who stand in the actual path of social and economic development

vii) Estudio, propaganda, organización (tomar aun Liebknecht no demasiado clasista)

…by the veteran German Social- Democrat, Liebknecht, as:
Studieren, Propagandieren, Organisieren.

viii) Ciencia para hacer superfluos a los intelectuales

There can be no dogmatism where the supreme and sole criterion of a doctrine is its conformity to the actual process of social and economic development; there can be no sectarianism when the task is that of promoting the organisation of the proletariat, and when, therefore, the role of the "intelligentsia" is to make special leaders from among the intelligentsia unnecessary

Lenin contra el vanguardismo burgués, el cual vincula al sectarismo (entonces éste, a sus ojos, pareciera cercano al caudillismo)

ix) Basamento pleno en la clase obrera y no en el campesinado

The political activity of the Social-Democrats lies in promoting the development and organisation of the workingclass movement in Russia, in transforming this movement from its present state of sporadic attempts at protest, "riots" and strikes devoid of a guiding idea, into an organised struggle of the WHOLE Russian working CLASS directed against the bourgeois regime and working for the expropriation of the expropriators and the abolition of the social system based on the oppression of the working people. Underlying these activities is the common conviction of Marxists that the Russian worker is the sole and natural representative of Russia's entire working and exploited population.*

Reflexión sobre esta formulación (es como si la clase obrera pudiera representar a otros explotados)

x) Contra la teoría del semifeudalismo y en pro de la teoría de las "formas de explotación capitalistas no clásicas"

Natural because the exploitation of the working people in Russia is everywhere capitalist in nature, if we leave out of account the moribund remnants of serf economy; but the

exploitation of the mass of producers is on a small scale, scattered and undeveloped, while the exploitation of the factory proletariat is on a large scale, socialised and concentrated. In the former case, exploitation is still enmeshed in medieval forms, various political, legal and conventional trappings, tricks and devices, which hinder the working people and their ideologists from seeing the essence of the system which oppresses the working people, from seeing where and how a way can be found out of this system. In the latter case, on the contrary, exploitation is fully developed and emerges in its pure form, without any confusing details.

xi) Vanguardia como vanguardia obrera (fracción empleada en la gran industria)

The worker cannot fail to see that he is oppressed by capital, that his struggle has to be waged against the bourgeois class. And this struggle, aimed at satisfying his immediate economic needs, at improving his material conditions, inevitably demands that the workers organise, and inevitably becomes a war not against individuals, but against a class, the class which oppresses and crushes the working people not only in the factories, but everywhere.

Lenin y la teoría de la vanguardia como vanguardia obrera (específicamente se refiere a la clase obrera ocupada en la gran industria). Intenta basar la lucha de clase en cuestiones materiales, desindividualizarla...Lenin también es enfático en la cuestión de que l alucha de es de "clase"

xii) La lucha desde los intereses y no desde la utopía

That is why the factory worker is none other than the foremost representative of the entire exploited population. And in order that he may fulfil his function of representative in an organised, sustained struggle it is by no means necessary to enthuse him with “perspectives”; all that is needed is simply to make him understand his position, to make him understand the political and economic structure of the system that oppresses him, and the necessity and inevitability of class antagonisms under this system.

xi) Vanguardia obrera (obrero plenamente expropiado, unificación contra ispersión que produce la pequeña explotación)

This position of the factory worker in the general system of capitalist relations makes him the sole fighter for the emancipation of the working class, for only the higher stage of development of capitalism, largescale machine industry, creates the material conditions and the social forces necessary for this struggle.

Everywhere else, where the forms of capitalist development are low, these material conditions are absent; production is scattered among thousands af tiny enterprises (and they do not cease to be scattered enterprises even under the most equalitarian forms of communal landownership), for the most part the exploited still possess tiny enterprises, and are thus tied to the very bourgeois system they should be fighting: this retards and hinders the development of the social force capable of overthrowing capitalism.

Scattered, individual, petty exploitation ties the working people to one locality, divides them, prevents them from becoming conscious of class solidarity, prevents them from uniting once they have understood that oppression is not caused by some particular individual, but by the whole economic system. Large-scale capitalism, on the contrary, inevitably severs all the workers' ties with the old society, with a particular locality and a particular exploiter; it unites them, compels them to think and places them in conditions which enable them to commence an organised struggle.

Vanguardia obrera y revolución permanente (revolución democrática contra el absolutismo se convierte en revolución comunista internacional)

Accordingly, it is on the working class that the Social-Democrats concentrate all their attention and all their activities. When its advanced representatives have mastered the ideas of scientific socialism, the idea of the historical role of the Russian worker, when these ideas become widespread, and when stable organisations are formed among the workers to transform the workers' present sporadic economic war into conscious class struggle—then the Russian WORKER, rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT (side by side with the proletariat of ALL COUNTRIES) along the straight road of open political struggle to THE VICTORIOUS COMMUNIST REVOLUTION

Deja en ambiguedad la cuestión de elementos democráticos (pero es mucho menos proburgués que Kautsky, Guesde y Hyndman, quienes explícitamente incluyen en su alianza al pequeño capital y al proletariado intelectual)

Anexo I

Anexo II

La lucha de clases como el núcleo estructural de la teoría marxista

Mr. Struve quite rightly makes the corner-stone of his criticism of Nik.—on the thesis that "Marx's doctrine of the class struggle and the state is completely foreign to the Russian political economist."… Mr. Struve the basis for a judgement of his system of views (I am not acquainted with his other articles) and I must say that I do not agree with all the statements he makes; and can, therefore, support only certain fundamental propositions he advances and not his article as a whole… To overlook the class struggle is indeed to reveal a gross misunderstanding of Marxism, a misunderstanding for which Mr. Nik.—on must be all the more blamed since he is so very anxious to pass himself off as a strict adherent of Marx's principles. Can anyone with the least knowledge of Marx deny that the doctrine of the class struggle is the pivot of his whole system of views?

Pero notar como el marxista legal Struve el que le critica al populista Danielson no ver esta lucha, con lo cual reafiramos nuestro juicio de que reconocer la lucha de clases (no

lleva a distinguir entre lucha entre explotados y explotadores y lucha entre clases explotadoras (capitalistas o pequeñoburgueses contra feudales); la crítica tipo Struve no es más que una versión un poco más fuerte de la oposición entre teoría del conflicto y teoría del consenso

No reconocer la lucha de clases en el seno del mpc lleva al utopismo reaccionario

And Mr. Struve quite rightly concluded that failure to understand the class struggle makes Mr. Nik.—on a utopian, for anybody who ignores the class struggle in capitalist society eo ipso ignores all the real content of the social and political life of this society… This failure to understand the class struggle makes him a reactionary, for appeals to "society" and to the "state," that is, to bourgeois ideologists and politicians, can only confuse the socialists, and cause them to accept the worst enemies of the proletariat as their allies, can only hamper the workers' struggle for emancipation instead of helping to strengthen, clarify and improve the organisation of that struggle

Misión histórica del mpc

i) Misión caricaturizada, bloqueo desarrollo capitalismo dependentsita en Danielson

"It appears," argues Mr. Nik.—on, citing data about the slow increase in the number of factory workers, an increase lagging behind the growth of the population, "that in our country capitalism, far from fulfilling its 'historic mission,' is itself setting limits to its own development.

ii) Crítica de Lenin a la caricatura de la misión hecha por el populismo

Apart from all the other virtues of this clever argument, the very "mission" of capitalism was understood by Mr. V. V., and is apparently understood by Mr. Nik.—on in an impossibly and preposterously false and narrow fashion. And again, of course, these gentlemen unceremoniously ascribe the narrowness of their own understanding to the Social-Democrats, who can be maligned like the dead since the legal press is closed to them!

iii) Misión histórica del mpc en Rusia según Lenin (1): no hay burguesía heorica ni aumento extraordinario de la producción, sino creación clase obrera clasista

As Marx saw it, the progressive and revolutionary work of capitalism consists in the fact that, in socialising labour, it at the same time "disciplines, unites and organises the working class" by the mechanism of that very process, it trains them for the struggle, organises their "revolt," unites them to "expropriate the expropriators," seize political power and wrest the means of production from the "few usurpers" and turn them over to society (Capital, p. 650). That is how Marx formulates it.

iv) Misión histórica del mpc en Rusia según Lenin (2): contra el mpc neokantiano solo compuesto de "gran industria"

Nothing, of course, is said here about the “number of factory workers”: Marx speaks of the concentration of the means of production and of the socialisation of labour. It is quite clear that these criteria have nothing in common with the “number of factory workers.”
But our exceptionalist interpreters of Marx misinterpret this to mean that the socialisation of labour under capitalism amounts to factory workers labouring under one roof, and that the progressiveness of the work of capitalism is therefore to be measured by ... the number of factory workers!!! If the number of factory workers is increasing, capitalism is doing its progressive work well; if the number is decreasing, it is “fulfilling its historic mission badly”

Dos crisis capitalisas post 1861 en Rusia (1880 y 1891-3)

…that capitalism is a “false” line of development, for it leads to unemployment and crises. We faced a crisis, they say, in 1880, and again in 1893

Caracterizando el capitalismo ruso

i) No medir su presencia solo concentrándose en una rama productiva (contra el tecnologcismo sociologizante de la “era del carbón”, etc)

* How can this idea be called anything but childish, when the progressive work of capitalism is not judged by the degree of socialisationof labour, but by such a fluctuating index of the development of only one branch of national labour! Everybody knows that the number of workers cannot be anything but extremely inconstant under the capitalist mode of production, and that it depends upon a host of secondary factors such as crises, the size of the reserve army, the degree of the exploitation of labour, the degree of its intensity, and so on and so forth.

I confine myself here to criticising Mr. Nik.—on’s method of judging “the unifying significance of capitalism” by the number of factory workers. I cannot undertake an analysis of the figures because I have not got Mr. Nik.—on’s sources handy…He first takes data for 1865 from the Military Statistical Abstract and those for 1890 from the Directory of Factories and Works of 1894. The number of workers he gets (exclusive of mine-workers)… Thus in the space of five pages the author uses some data that show an increase of 5% and others showing an increase of 48%!...And then why did not the author take the data on the number of workers quoted in the Sketches (Tables XI and XII), and from which we see that it increased by 12-13% in three years (1886-1889) an increase that far outstrips the growth of population?... Obviously, if such a fluctuating index as the number of workers is used to indicate the state of only one branch of national labour those data cannot be anything but shaky.

ii) Struve y la reducción del mpc a una clase obrera industrial que consiste en un 1%

Instead, Mr. Nik.—on sets about analysing the data on the number of our factory workers (1% of the population, according to his estimate). But was Mr. Struve speaking of factory

workers? Does the 20% of the population in Russia and the 56% in America represent factory workers? Are the terms “factory workers” and “population not engaged in agriculture” identical?

iii) Lenin y el carácter capitalista y estructural de las formas de explotación no clásicas

Firstly, it is absurd to identify the number of factory workers with the number of workers engaged in capitalist production, as is done by the author of the Sketches.* This is repeating (and even aggravating) the error of the Russian petty-bourgeois economists who make large-scale machine industry the very beginning of capitalism. Are not the millions of Russian handicraftsmen who work for merchants, with the latter’s material and for ordinary wages, engaged in capitalist production? Do the regular farm labourers and day labourers in agriculture not receive wages from their employers, and do they not surrender surplus-value to them? Are not the workers in the building industry (which has rapidly developed in our country since the Reform) subjected to capitalist exploitation? And so on.**

iv) Lenin y un carácter de vanguardia de los obreros industriales que no niega el carácter capitalista del resto de Rusia y el estatus “obrero” de sus trabajdores

But if that is so, why judge the “mission” of capitalism by the number of factory workers, when this “mission” is fulfilled by the development of capitalism and the socialisation of labour in general, by the creation of a proletariat in general, in relation to which the factory workers play the role only of frontrankers, the vanguard. There is, of course, no doubt that the revolutionary movement of the proletariat depends on the number of these workers, on their concentration, on the degree of their development, etc.; but all this does not give us the slightest right to equate the “unifying significance” of capitalism with the number of factory workers.

v) Lenin recurre al “2do Prefacio” de “Sobre la cuestión de la vivienda” (Engels, 1887)

I will give you an example. In his pamphlet Zur Wohnungsfrage,* Frederick Engels

v.i) Des desigual y combinado (formas de explotación no clásicas como fuente de mayor explotación y bloqueo lucha de clases) y comparación Alemania con Rusia

I will give you an example. In his pamphlet Zur Wohnungsfrage,* Frederick Engels speaks of German industry and points out that in no other country—he is referring only to Western Europe—do there exist so many wageworkers who own a garden or a plot of land. “Rural domestic industry carried on in conjunction with kitchen-gardening or ... agriculture,” he says, “forms the broad basis of Germany’s new large-scale industry.” This domestic industry grows increasingly with the growing distress of the German small peasant (as is the case in Russia, let us add), but the COMBINATION of industry with agriculture is the basis not of the WELL-BEING of the domestic producer, the

handicraftsman, but on the contrary, of his greater OPPRESSION. Being tied to his locality, he is compelled to accept any price, and therefore surrenders to the capitalist not only surplus- value but a large part of his wages as well (as is the case in Russia, with her vast development of the domestic system of large-scale production).

v.ii) Des desigual y combinado (formas de explotación no clásicas como espoleador de la rev industrial y generación de franjas clasistas en el agro)

"That is one side of the matter," Engels continues, "but it also has its reverse side.... With the expansion of domestic industry, one peasant area after another is being dragged into the present-day industrial movement. It is this revolutionising of the rural areas by domestic industry which spreads the industrial revolution in Germany over a far wider territory than was the case in England and France.... This explains why in Germany, in contrast to England and France, the revolutionary workingclass movement has spread so tremendously over the greater part of the country instead of being confined exclusively to the urban centres. And this in turn explains the tranquil, certain and irresistible progress of the movement. It is perfectly clear that in Germany a victorious rising in the capital and in the other big cities will be possible only when the majority of the smaller towns and a great part of the rural districts have become ripe for the revolutionary change."

v.iii) Comparación Alemania y Rusia para explicar la generación de franjas clasistas en el agro mediante des desigual y comb del mpc

So you see, it appears that not only the "unifying significance of capitalism," but also the success of the workingclass movement depends not only on the number of factory workers, but also on the number of ... handicraftsmen! Yet our exceptionalists, ignoring the purely capitalist organisation of the vast majority of the Russian handicraft industries, contrast them, as a sort of "people's" industry, to capitalism and judge "the percentage of the population at the direct disposal of capitalism" by the number of factory workers!

Lenin toma Engels para argumentar la presencia capitalista de las formas de explotación no clásicas (y no las considera como primeras formas destinadas a desaparecer, sino que como parte estructural de un capitalismo avanzado, como reproducidas por las formas avanzadas de capitalismo en la gran industria). Este anexo muestra como para Lenin la idea de mpc como mera gra industria en su fae final es una hipótesis marginal, mientras que la existencia estructural y sincrónica en el periodo ya maduro del mpc supone formas de explotación no clásicas, y su reproducción por parte de una revolución industrial qe carga consigo formas avanzadas (esta perspectiva ya está delienada hacia el final de su segundo atículo de 1893)

vi) Lenin recurre a El Capital I para mostrar el mpc maduro contiene estructuralmente amplias fracciones explotadas mediante formas no clásicas

On p. 393 of Capital,99 Marx quotes figures of the composition of the English population. In 1861 there was a total of 20 million people in England and Wales. Of these, 1,605,440 persons were employed in the main branches of factory industry.* Furthermore, there

were 1,208,648 members of the servant class, and in a footnote to the second edition Marx refers to the very rapid growth of this class. Now just imagine that there were "Marxists" in England who divided 1,600,000 by 20,000,000 to judge the "unifying significance of capitalism"!! The result would be 8%—less than one-twelfth!!! How can one speak of the "mission" of capitalism when it has not united even onetwelfth of the population, and when, moreover, there is a more rapid increase in the "domestic slave" class—representing a dead loss of "national labour," which shows that "we," the English, are following the "wrong path"! Is it not clear that "we" must "seek different," non-capitalist "paths of development for our fatherland"?!

¿Ausencia de un movimiento obrero clasista masivo como refutación de la existencia de mpc o de su supuesta misión histórica?

Evidently, Mr. Mikhailovsky takes the absence of any "manifestation" of a working-class movement as grounds for asserting that it is not applicable in our case

i) El marxismo legal de Struve reproduce la idea populista básica (Mikhailosvky) de que Marx partió con un proletariado ya creado

This argument, it seems to me, was anticipated by Mr. Mikhailovsky. Marx operated with a ready-made proletariat—he admonished the Marxists

ii) Miseria de la Filosofía y una semilla de crítica al populismo que solo ve a la clase obrera "desde arriba" como "pobres miserables"

The Poverty of Philosophy. Marx there says of the communists of the old school that they saw in poverty nothing but poverty without seeing its revolutionary, destructive side, which would overthrow the old society.

iii) Lenin: El comunismo de Marx es anterior a 1848, cuando el mov obrero clasista alemán era menor

In reference to this argument, let us remark, firstly, that only a most superficial acquaintance with the facts can give rise to the idea that Marx operated with a ready-made proletariat. Marx's communist programme was drawn up before 1848. What working-class movement* was there in Germany then?

El error parcial de Lenin está en el hecho de que el comunismo de M y E se deriva de las luchas de masas francesas (comunismo neobauvista) e inglesas (franjas proletarias del cartismo), y además importa un cambio cualitativo justo analizando el alza de lucha de clases alemán (huelga semi-insurreccional en Silesia en 1845, avance de socialismo). De ahí que Lenin opera un parcial idealismo, el cul aún estaa presente en la intro a Crítica de la filosofía del derecho de Hegel de fines de 1843

iv) Crítica al mpc neokantiano mediante la referencia al anti-populista critica al programa de Gotha

(Nota al pie)* The smallness of the working class at that time may be judged from the fact that 27 years later, in 1875, Marx wrote that "the majority of the toiling people in Germany consists of peasants, and not of proletarians. That is what, "operating (??) with a readymade proletariat" comes down to!

v) Crítica al mpc neokantiano que reafirma el importante rol de la política y la organización en la creación de este mov obrero clasista masivo

The Social-Democratic labour movement, which made the revolutionary and unifying role of capitalism quite clear to everybody, began two decades later, when the doctrine of scientific socialism had definitely taken shape, when large-scale industry had become more widespread, and there emerged numerous talented and energetic disseminators of this doctrine among the working class

…foist upon Marx the most senseless fatalistic views. In his opinion, they assure us, the organisation and socialisation of the workers occur spontaneously, and, consequently, if we see capitalism but do not see a working-class movement, that is because capitalism is not fulfilling its mission, and not because we are still doing too little in the matter of organisation and propaganda among the workers. This cowardly petty-bourgeois artifice of our exceptionalist philosophers is not worth refuting: it is refuted by all the activities of the Social- Democrats in all countries; it is refuted by every public speech made by any Marxist. Social-Democracy—as Kautsky very justly remarks—is a fusion of the workingclass movement and socialism. And in order that the progressive work of capitalism may "manifest" itself in this country too, our socialists must set to work with the utmost energy; they must work out in greater detail the Marxist conception of the history and present position of Russia, and make a more concrete investigation of all forms of the class struggle and exploitation, which are particularly complex and masked in Russia. They must, furthermore, popularize this theory and make it known to the worker; they must help the worker to assimilate it and devise the form of organisation most SUITABLE under our conditions for disseminating Social-Democratic ideas and welding the workers into a political force

Lenin contra el automatismo que muestra Kautsky en 1892. El desarrollo de un movimiento obrero clasista no es producto automático de la evolución económica del capitalismo,sino que se deriva en gran medida del esfuerzo político-organizativo. En este punto Lenin tiene mayor cercanía con el Engels de On the History of the communist League, 1885 que con Kautsky
Lenin busca autoridad en Kautsky y no subraya que su misma producción es opuesta a la de éste (no sabemos hasta que punto Lenin fue consciente de esto, hasta que puto solo le hizo el juego a Kautsky para ser leído y ganar influencia en el movimiento obrero internacional). De todos modos pone en boca de Kautsky un mensaje clasista, por lo que referencia no es sustantiva, sino terminológica…

Contra la conversión de la división del pueblo en clases en el seno de las formas de explotación no clásicas en "sistema popular"

Besides its unsatisfactory and preposterously narrow conception of the Marxist theory, this common objection that progressive work is lacking in our capitalism seems to be based on the absurd idea of a mythical “people’s system.”

Lenin era parte de un contexto en el cual la referencia a la "utopía reaccionaria" era común

Let us see how matters stand with Mr. Struve’s article. Accusing Mr. Nik.—on of utopianism that leads inevitably to a reactionary programme, and of naïveté, he quite clearly indicates the grounds which led him to such an opinion.

De ahí que la "utopía reformista" sea un signo de retroceso de todo el debate intelectual marxistizante...

Crítica al fetiche societal que omite la lucha de clases

Did Mr. Nik.—on really take account of the class struggle inherent in capitalist society? He did not. He speaks of society and the state, and forgets this struggle, excludes it…. He evidently believes that the state could have behaved this way or that, and, consequently, that it stands above classes…. naïve and reactionary utopian?

Lenin toma esta crítica al fetiche de lo social y la desarrolla harto. Como vimos, el pelado se basa en la glosas críticas al programa de Gotha, por lo que no es descaminado pensar que su crítica a lo social la derive de ahí y la desarrolle precisamente tomando como premisa este documento...

Anexo III

La ciencia marxista específicamente para desarrollar programa. Lenin y lo democrático-clasista

Is it not a fact that the task of theory, the aim of science, is here defined as assistance for the oppressed class in its actual economic struggle.

> *“We do not say to the world: Cease struggling—your whole struggle is senseless. All we do is to provide it with a true slogan of struggle.”*

Hence, the direct task of science, according to Marx, is to provide a true slogan of struggle, that is, to be able to present this struggle objectively as the product of a definite system of production relations, to be able to understand the necessity of this struggle, its content, course and conditions of development. **It is impossible to provide a “slogan of struggle” unless we study every separate form of the struggle minutely; unless we trace every stage of the struggle during the transition from one form to another**, so that we can define the situation at any given moment, without losing sight of the general character of the struggle and its general aim, namely, the complete and final abolition of all exploitation and all oppression

Lenin toma al Marx de 1843 para sustanciar su idea de que la ciencia marxista se basa en la formulación de un programa. Que la formulación de las reivindicaciones democrático-clasistas son esencialmente el producto final de la teoría, su meta, su objetivo. Lenin y una teoría-práctica que a la vez enfatiza en lo democrático-clasista sobre todo porque no es politicista, sino que subraya que se trata de la lucha económica de la clase obrera

Lenin y sus diferencias con los populistas ("clase obrera" vs "pueblo trabajador")

Try to compare with the demands of this theory our Narodnik literature, which, after all, is also prompted by the desire to be the ideological spokesman of the working people, a literature devoted to the history and to the present state of our economic system in general and of the peasantry in particular, and you will be astonished that socialists could be satisfied with a theory that confines itself to studying and describing distress and to moralising over it. Serfdom is depicted not as a definite form of economic organisation which gave rise to such and such exploitation, such and such antagonistic classes, certain political, legal and other systems, but simply as abuses by the landlords and injustice to the peasants

El énfasis en la cultura y no en la producción como rasgo definido y propio del populismo ruso

To give a clear illustration of the corruption the "friends of the people" have caused in the "meagre Russian thought" of today by their call to the intelligentsia to exert a cultural influence on the "people" so as to "create" a real and proper industry

Unidad revolucionaria, partido democrático y unidad de acción

….the formation of the Narodnoye Pravo party is a step forward, a step towards the complete abandonment of the illusions and dreams about "different paths for the fatherland," towards the fearless recognition of the real paths, and towards the search on their basis for elements for a revolutionary struggle. Here we clearly see a striving to form a democratic party. I speak only of a "striving," because, unfortunately, the Narodopravtsi do not implement their basic thesis consistently. **They still talk of amalgamation and alliance with the socialists, refusing to realise that to draw the workers into mere political radicalism would only mean severing the worker intellectuals from the mass of the workers and condemning the workingclass movement to impotence; for it can be strong only by defending the interests of the working class completely and in every way, by engaging in economic struggle against capital, a struggle inseparably bound up with a political struggle against the servants of capital**. They refuse to realize that the "amalgamation" of all the revolutionary elements can be much better achieved by the separate organisation of the representatives of the different interests* and by the joint action of the two parties in particular cases.

(Nota al pie) They themselves protest against faith in the miracle-working powers of the intelligentsia; they themselves talk of the need to draw the people themselves into the

struggle. But this requires that the struggle be bound up with definite everyday interests and, consequently, that a distinction be made between the different interests, and that they be drawn separately into the struggle.... But if these separate interests are obscured by bare political demands that only the intelligentsia understand, will this not mean again turning back, again confining everything to the struggle of the intelligentsia alone whose impotence has only just been admitted?

Lenin se opone a la formación de un partido revolucionario (a la unidad de los revolucionarios), e incluso al frente único revolucionario. Subraya la diferencia de intereses de clase en su seno y apuesta meramente a la "unidad de acción". La lucha de por un partido revolucionario o democrático puro solo ayudará a desligar a la vanguardia obrera del resto de la clase y vincularla orgánicamente a los intereses de la intelligentsia. Pero esto tiene el contra que antes Lenin mostró (el buscar influenciar la creación de un verdadero partido democrático de la burguesía progre). De todos modos, esta críica cae como un anillo al dedo a los mandelistas y su fetiche de la juventud (separan a la vanguardia obrera de la clae y la unen con la intelligentsia burguesa)